MARKAN PUBLIC DEBATE:
LITERARY TECHNIQUE, CONCENTRIC STRUCTURE
AND THEOLOGY IN MARK 2:1-3:6

A dissertation by
Joanna Dewey

presented to
The Faculty of the
Graduate Theological Union
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California
July, 1977

Committee Signatures:

John L. Boyle
Coordinator

Ernest R. Martinez

Antoinette Wire Kolenkow

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS vii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS viii

INTRODUCTION 1

I. RHETORICAL CRITICISM: ANTECEDENTS AND METHODOLOGY 5

Relation of the Rhetorical Method to Redaction Criticism 8

Relation of the Rhetorical Method to Literary Criticism 14

Selection of Materials for Analysis 22

Building on Previous Research 27

Literary Techniques 49

Postscript 67

II. MARK 2:1-3:6 AND 11:12: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS 70

Mark 2:1-3:6 72

Martin Albertz 73

Critical Reactions to Albertz' Hypothesis 77

Alternate Theories of Premarkan Collections 84

The Possibility of No Premarkan Collection 93

Mark 11-12: Jerusalem Public Debate 99

Overview of the Narrative of Mark 11-12 from a Literary Perspective 101

Proposed Explanations of the Jerusalem Public Debate Material 108

III. FIRST READING OF MARK 2:1-3:6 114
  - Mark 2:1-12: The Healing of the Paralytic 115
    - Rhetorical Analysis of the Individual Elements 117
    - The Ring Composition as a Rhetorical Unit 123
    - Exegetical Notes on Mark 2:1-12 130
  - Mark 2:13-17: The Call of Levi and Eating with Sinners 142
    - Rhetorical Analysis of the Individual Elements 143
    - Verses 13-17 as a Rhetorical Unit 151
    - Relation of 2:13-17 to 2:1-12 154
    - Exegetical Notes 156
  - Mark 2:18-22: The Question About Fasting 159
    - Verses 18-20 161
    - Verses 21-22 166
    - Verses 18-22 as a Whole 168
  - Mark 2:23-28: Plucking Grain on the Sabbath 170
    - Indications of the Overall Rhetorical Structure 172
    - Analysis of the Individual Elements 174
    - The Use of "Son of man" in 2:28 179
  - Mark 3:1-6: The Man with the Withered Hand 181
    - Rhetorical Analysis of the Individual Parts 183
    - The Pericope as a Whole 189
  - The Frame Around Mark 2:1-3:6 190
  - Summary 192

IV. SECOND READING OF MARK 2:1-3:6 195

The Rhetorical Pattern of Mark 2:1-3:6 as a Whole 195

The Significance of the Structure for the Meaning of Mark 2:1-3:6 208

Linear or Climactic Development in 2:1-3:6 208

The Concentric Pattern as an Aid to Understanding Mark 2:1-3:6 212

Excursus on the Son of Man in 2:10 and 28 218

Excursus on the Role of the Disciples in Mark 2:1-3:6 222

Summary 229

V. CONCENTRIC STRUCTURE IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK 231

Criteria for Identifying Concentric Patterns 231

Recognition of Mark 2:1-3:6 as a Symmetrical Pattern 238

Other Concentric Structures in the Gospel of Mark 251

Mark 1:1-8 254

Mark 4:1-34 257

Mark 11-12 265

Rhetorical Features 266

A Symmetrical Pattern in Mark 12:1-40 271

Mark 12:1-40 in the Jerusalem Public Ministry 284

Conclusion 289

Criteria for Identifying Concentric Patterns, Reconsidered 291

Criteria Employed in Mark 1:1-8; 4:1-34 and 12:1-40 291

Mark 1:21-45(2:12): A Passage Without a Concentric Structure 297

Conclusion 310

VI. MARK 2:1-3:6 IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK 313

Is Mark 2:1-3:6 a Markan Construction? 313

Interconnections between Mark 1:16-45 and 2:1-3:6 315

Literary Techniques 318

Theology 321

Summary 331

Excursus: Did Mark Use a Shorter Controversy Collection in Constructing 2:1-3:6? 332

The Role of 2:1-3:6 in Mark's Gospel: Conclusion 335

BIBLIOGRAPHY 341

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations follow those used in the Journal of Biblical Literature (as specified in vol. 95 [June, 1976] pp. 339-346).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my teachers, my fellow graduate students, and my friends among biblical scholars for the encouragement and assistance they have given me throughout my graduate studies and particularly in the writing of my dissertation.

First of all, I wish to acknowledge my debt to Edward C. Hobbs who, in the course of my studies for the M. Div. at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, communicated to me his fascintion with the gospel of Mark, and his conviction that a literary approach to the gospel would elucidate our understanding of it.

Second, I wish to thank my teachers and fellow graduate students at the Graduate Theological Union who introduced me to the approaches of the analysis of literary structure and rhetorical criticism. I am indebted above all to John L. Boyle, S.J. He first introduced me to the work of Catholic scholars on literary structure--including concentric structure in Mark. Further he has been the coordinator of my dissertation project. He has been consistently helpful and supportive in that not-always-to-be-envied role. I should also like to express my appreciation of James Muilenburg and his graduate students who were my peers and with whom I worked--Don Christianson, Bonnie Pedrotti Kittel, George P. Rideout and Jack B. Lundbom, for the introduction they gave me to the methods and excitement of rhetorical criticism.

For the dissertation itself, I wish to acknowledge my debt to my commitee for their helpfulness in providing constructive advice and much needed support. My thanks go to Frederick H. Borsch and Victor R. Gold for their help in the preliminary stages of my work and their contribution to my Dissertation Prospectus Defense. My thanks go especially to the final readers of my dissertation, to Ernest R. Martinez, S.J., Anitra Bingham Kolenkow who was ever willing to read and evaluate sections of the manuscript upon ten minutes notice, and of course to John Boyle.

Finally, I wish to thank John E. Huesman, S.J., for his administrative support, John H. Elliott of the University of San Francisco and Norman Perrin of Chicago for their scholarly support and advice, and Albert Henrichs, now at Harvard University, and Neal Flannagan for their helpful and detailed critiques of my initial presentation of the structure of Mark 2:1-3:6, published in JBL 92 (1973).

2)

INTRODUCTION

Rhetorical criticism, so named by James Muilenburg, is a methodological approach which is increasingly being applied to the Biblical writings. It is the study of the literary techniques and rhetorical structure of a text to see what light such analysis sheds on the interrelationships of the parts of the text and the meaning of the text as a whole. The rhetorical approach employs as its material the final text without consideration for historical questions of what is redaction and what is tradition. It involves the careful and detailed rhetorical analysis of the content, form, small structures, and use of word repetition in a text in order to determine the larger structure and rhetorical emphases of that text. Through the study of the literary means of a text, rhetorical analysis seeks a fuller understanding and appreciation of the text.

Rhetorical criticism, like form and redaction criticism, can only examine small portions of a narrative at a time. The following study is a contribution towards the rhetorical analysis of the gospel of Mark by its rhetorical analysis of the Galilean controversy section of Mark 2:1-3:6, and its survey of extended concentric structure or symmetrical rhythm in the gospel of Mark.

The focus of the study is two-fold: first, the actual practice and results of rhetorical criticism; and second, a consideration of the methodology appropriate for the rhetorical analysis of Mark. The rhetorical analysis consists of a detailed investigation of Mark 2:1-3:6[1] and a much briefer consideration of the rhetorical structure of Mark 1:1-8; 4:1-34, and 11-12, the Jerusalem ministry with its several public debates. The methodological portion of the study focuses primarily on the issues of concentric structure, first the question of adequate criteria for identifying concentric literary patterns, and second, the question of how recognition of a symmetrical pattern helps the reader to interpret the text.

Rhetorical analysis, as it is practiced in this study, is not a branch of redaction criticism, but an independent approach. However, as contributions to the knowledge of markan redaction, (1) Mark 2:1-3:6 and 11:27-37 are investigated to see if the overall literary structure of the public debate sections is markan or premarkan, and (2) the gospel of Mark is surveyed to see if the concentric organization of material may be considered a markan literary technique.

The first two chapters of the study concern preliminary matters. Chapter one is an introduction to the methodology of rhetorical criticism, its relationship to other methodological approaches, and its debt to and dependence upon previous research on the gospel of

---

[1] I first presented my analysis of the overall structure of Mk 2:1-3:6 in "The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2:1-3:6," JBL 92 (1973) 394-401.

Mark. Chapter two is an introduction to the issues involved in studying Mark 2:1-3:6 and 11-12, primarily by means of an evaluation of hypotheses for premarkan controversy collections. It is concluded that a premarkan collection for 2:1-3:6 is a possibility but not a certainty, and that no premarkan controversy collection lies behind Mark 11-12.

Chapters three and four present the detailed rhetorical analysis of 2:1-3:6. Chapter three contains a description of the literary techniques and rhetorical structure of the five individual pericopes that make up the Galilean controversy section. It contains a limited discussion of the implications of the results of the rhetorical study for the exegesis and determination of the redaction of the pericopes. Chapter four first describes the overall concentric rhetorical pattern of 2:1-3:6, and then explores the significance of both the linear development and the concentric structure for understanding the content and meaning of 2:1-3:6.

Chapters five and six deal with issues raised by the rhetorical analysis. Chapter five focuses on concentric structure in the gospel of Mark: criteria for identifying such literary patterns, the question of audience recognition of rhetorical symmetry, and the existence of concentric patterns elsewhere in the gospel of Mark. On the basis of a brief rhetorical analysis of the structure of Mark 1:1-8, 4:1-34, and 12:1-40, it is concluded that concentric structure is one of Mark's literary devices for organizing and structuring his material. In chapter six, it is argued that the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6

is due to Mark's redaction of tradition, not to his interpolation of a source. Finally, the role of 2:1-3:6 in the narrative and theology of Mark is summarized.

Thus, the study contributes to the development of the methodology of rhetorical criticism. It also contributes to markan studies, (1) through the identification of extended symmetrical structure a[illegible] of Mark's literary devices, (2) through the determination that Mark 2:1-3:6 is a markan compilation and not a premarkan source, and (3) through an increased understanding of the theology of 2:1-3:6. Further, it indicates how the rhetorical approach can assist other methodological approaches in their respective tasks.

The rhetorical analysis will show that the author of the gospel of Mark is a writer of considerable narrative skill, adept at interweaving the elements of his story. It is hoped that this study will lead the reader to a better literary appreciation of the gospel of Mark, for the literary or rhetorical critic is engaged in the enterprise of educating or sensitizing the reader to the gospel as a reading experience.

CHAPTER I

RHETORICAL CRITICISM:
ANTECEDENTS AND METHODOLOGY

The term, "literary technique," in the broadest sense may cover everything from minor style characteristics such as an author's fondness for the historic present through use of rhetorical devices, techniques of anticipation and contrast, to the means of structuring an entire work. Basically, literary techniques are the tools available to any author or story teller to convey what he or she wishes to say. An author may use simple or complex techniques, he may use techniques which are familiar to his audience or ones strange to them, he may use techniques skillfully or awkwardly, intentionally or unconsciously. But he must use techniques--that is, he must relate his content in words and structure the words in some way--if he is to get his content tent or message across to his audience at all.

From the point of view of the literary critic or researcher, a study of literary techniques employed in a text is one way of studying a text. It is the study of how a narrative is written (or told) or a poem constructed. Such a study may be done for its own sake, the study of style. It may be done for historical or comparative reasons, to trace the development of a literary tradition, to contrast techniques of oral and written composition, or to compare one author with

UMI

another. Or such a study may be undertaken, as in this dissertation, in order to achieve a better understanding of a text. Literary techniques are isolated and analyzed in order for us to become conscious of their occurrence in a text and to see what and how they contribute to the meaning and/or effectiveness of a text. A study of techniques, then, is one way toward a fuller understanding of a text, and how its creator intended it to be read.

The presupposition of such a study is that the text, in this case the gospel of Mark, may be treated as a legitimate literary entity, even if it does contain layers of tradition and redaction. The final text is considered to have a validity of its own, independent of its prehistory.[1] It may be studied in itself.

The first step of the study is to describe the occurrence of literary devices in the text. A review of the literature on the gospel of Mark suggests that repetition of words and motifs, and symmetrical techniques from insertion through intercalation to extended concentric structures are devices employed with great frequency in Mark.[2] This stage of the analysis is basically descriptive and relatively objective. On the whole, scholars should be able to agree on whether or not a literary device is found in a text.

---

[1] The same presupposition underlies a structuralist approach to a text. Structuralism, however, attempts to identify the deep structures underlying the text and its parts, while my interest is in the surface structure or patterns in all their particularity and concreteness.

[2] See below, pp. 29-40.

The second step, and where the study goes beyond a description of style, is to interpret how each occurrence of a device functions in the literary expression of the text. Generally speaking, a technique may function as an indicator of structure or as an indicator of rhetorical purpose--emphasis, climax, contrast, etc.--without indicating structure.[3] Some devices may always serve a particular function, while others may act in a variety of ways. A device may serve more than one function. Structure, as determined by literary devices, functions to interrelate the parts of the structure to each other. Such an analysis of narrative function is both art and science. Its value depends on the sensitivity and acumen of the critic as well as on the data provided by the text.

The third step is to see what light the literary-rhetorical understanding of the text may shed on our understanding of the text's meaning or theology. An awareness of structure, the interrelationship of parts into a larger whole, and an awareness of rhetorical stress should lead to a better understanding of the theological intentions and emphases of a narrative. Further, rhetorical analysis should serve as a control on exegesis, limiting the possibilities of understanding, excluding some interpretations on the grounds that they conflict with the rhetorical features of a passage.

The aim or purpose of the study, then, is twofold. On the literary level, the rhetorical critic strives to educate or sensitize the reader to the gospel of Mark as a reading (or aural) experience. On the theological level, the rhetorical critic seeks to clarify our understanding of a text as a whole through study of the "indications of how the author wanted us to read and understand the story,"[4] and, using the approach as a control, on other methodologies to resolve _some_ exegetical difficulties and theological ambiguities. The rhetorical method, then, is a valuable _additional_ methodology, largely untapped, for understanding the Biblical material.

---

[3] George P. Ridout, "Prose Compositional Techniques in the Succession Narrative (2 Sam 7, 9-20; 1 Kings 1-2)," (Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1971) pp. a-b.

Relation of the Rhetorical Method to Redaction Criticism

Today, the dominant methodology for studying the gospel of Mark is redaction criticism. But the model for this dissertation is not to be found in such studies on Mark, even as they have come to employ more of the methodology of general literary criticism. The aims are different: redaction criticism attempts to understand Mark's theological intentions and the _Sitz im Leben_ of his gospel; it attempts to answer historical questions raised by the text and by our interest in early Christianity. Rhetorical or literary criticism does not concern itself directly with historical questions about Mark, his community, or the traditions he used, but rather views the text as a given and attempts to illumine its meaning through study of its means of expression.

The difference in the two methods can be seen clearly in the way they employ literary techniques. Redaction criticism has used literary techniques (in particular intercalation and insertion) as a means of separating markan redaction from tradition,[5] or as a direct index to Mark's theology, a superstructure deduced from the text.[6] The rhetorical approach to literary techniques uses them as a tool for achieving a literary understanding of the text. They serve as a guide to determine the literary structure of a text, and as a means for grasping in what light a passage is meant to be read.[7]

---

[4] Edwin M. Good, _Irony in the Old Testament_ (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), p. 58.

Thus, no systematic attention is given in this study to whether or not each particular occurrence of a device is Mark's original composition, redaction, or reporting of tradition. Nor is any attempt made to establish literary devices as definitive criteria for distinguishing redaction from tradition. It is doubtful that any such exact criteria can be established whereby literary techniques in isolation from other factors could discriminate between Mark and tradition. Mark unquestionably has a fondness for certain literary devices. Nonetheless such devices belong to a pool of techniques generally available to all narrators--whether of oral or written material. And it can be as problematic to determine the origin of any specific instance of a literary device as it is to determine if any given saying in the gospels contains the ipsissima verba of Jesus. The same problems exists that exists in the use of style as an indicator of Mark's active redaction of a text: the use of the historic present and kai parataxis are unquestionably markan stylistic characteristics, yet both are also characteristics of oral literature. Any individual instance of an historic present verb, for example, does not provide enough information to tell us whether the occurrence is due to Mark or his use of tradition. We can only draw inferences on the basis of "sufficient" markan stylistic characteristics in a given length of text[8] and of additional information such as vocabulary, usage, content, place within or connecting pericopes, and congruence with Mark's thought.

---

[5] So Norman Perrin, "The Christology of Mark: A Study in Methodology," JR 51 (1971) 174; and Robert H. Stein, "The Proper Methodology for Ascertaining a Markan Redaction History," NovT 13 (1971) 184, 193-194.

[6] So, for example, John R. Donahue writes, "The second way in which redaction criticism has developed does not stress the distinction between tradition and redaction, but concentrates on modes of composition, literary devices, and the discovery of patterns and structures, all of which serve as an index to Mark's thought." (Are you the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark [SBLDS 10; Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, for the Seminar on Mark, 1973], p. 41.)

[7] The attempt to determine the genre of Mark or the gospels is another approach to the same issue of in what light, under what rubrics, is the text to be read.

The present work, however, will contain a systematic testing of the larger concentric structure I shall identify in Mark 2:1-3:6 to see if the structure is to be attributed to Mark or to his incorporation of a prior collection or source. Such a test is possible because the section is sufficiently extensive to provide enough data, both linguistic and theological.[9] It is necessary because the section of the gospel chosen for detailed study is one in which many scholars hold that Mark has incorporated a premarkan collection. If the literary pattern I identify is actually the structure of an earlier collection which Mark has used unmodified, then no generalizations can be made from that structure to the composition techniques of the gospel, or to the theology of Mark. The redactional aspect of this study, which will show the final structure to be markan, is a useful contrbution to our knowledge of markan compositional techniques and redaction. It is also a confirmation of the presupposition of the study--that the text may be treated as a literary whole.

---

[8] With the aid of a computer, it would be possible to establish guides based on statistical probability as to how many stylistic characteristics are "sufficient" to indicate markan activity. The work would be similar to Lloyd Gaston's probability word study of individual vocabulary words. (Horae Synopticae Electronicae: Word Statistics of the Synoptic Gospels [SBLSBS 3; Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973]). At the moment, however, such decisions are quite arbitrary and subjective.

Also, as a beneficial side-effect, the rhetorical analysis does sometimes shed light on questions of tradition and redaction. Awareness of how the individual parts fit together into a larger structure and of the placing of rhetorical emphasis can aid the reader in determining how things which seem strange in the gospel of Mark--e.g., the two uses of Son of man in 2:10,28 or the acclamation "the coming kingdom of our father David" in 11:10--are to be interpreted. If they are not stressed rhetorically in the narrative, and if they do not bear on themes being emphasized by the structure, then they probably represent traditions which Mark could assimilate but which were not important to his own theology or polemic. If, on the other hand, the strange material is highlighted by the structure or by literary devices that focus attention on it, then probably the material may be considered a markan emphasis.[10]

---

[9] For the methodology of redaction criticism, see Perrin, _What is Redaction Criticism_? (London: SPCK, 1970); Stein, "What is Redaktiongeschichte?" _JBL_ 88 (1969) 45-56; Stein, "Methodology," 181-198.

The study of literary structure and rhetorical emphasis can upon occasion help confirm conclusions reached by form and redaction criticism: when, for instance, a form critical study of an individual pericope, of a premarkan collection, and a literary study of the structure of a final text reach the same conclusion about the tradition history of the text, then perhaps scholars can agree that it is fact (the criterion of multiple methodologies). Also, occasionally, the approach via literary techniques and structure which provides a different perspective upon tradition-history questions, will thereby suggest solutions to some questions that other methodologies cave been unable to answer. So while the present study is not an exercise in redaction criticism and no attempt is made to address many of the questions a redaction critic would ask concerning the same material, this study does make a contribution to markan redaction criticism.

For the two approaches, rhetorical-literary and redactional critical, are complementary. Both seek to understand the meaning of the gospel, and they can aid each other in the task. The literary approach builds on source, form and redaction criticism, that is, on that which is already known. In particular, rhetorical analysis which ignores the forms of early Christian discourse is liable to produce some rather grotesque results.

---

[10] For instance, after arguing on other grounds that Mk 11:10a is redactional, Werner H. Kelber writes that, "The sheer foreignness of the Davidic acclamation is to catch the attention of the reader, and to question its validity" (The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974], pp. 94, 96).

Likewise, form or redaction criticism that ignores the rhetorical function of something in Mark's text is building on an unsound base. For example, the reappearance of the Pharisees and Herodians in Mark 12:13 functions as a rhetorical cue to the hearer to recall the controversies of Mark 2:1-3:6 and the Pharisees' and Herodians' decision to plot against Jesus. Therefore, it is exceedingly questionable that the mention of the Herodians in 12:13 is reliable evidence to help answer the historical questions of the extent of a premarkan controversy collection or Jesus' actual opponents.[11]

Further, the understanding of literary structure is fundamental to good exegesis, for it is the pattern that indicates the relationship of the individual part to the larger units or to the whole. Thus, a literary approach can assist redaction criticism (and control some flights of fancy) by its insistent reminder that the text must be understood first of all on its own terms, as a narrative, and not just as a key to history or theology.

---

[11] See the helpful article by Roland Mushat Frye, "A Literary Perspective for the Criticism of the Gospels," Jesus and Man's Hope (eds. Donald G. Miller and Dikran Y. Hadidian; Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1971), Vol. 2, pp. 193-221, esp. p. 220, fn. 41.

Relation of the Rhetorical Method to Literary Criticism

If the model for this dissertation is not a redaction critical study, neither is the model a comprehensive literary analysis. This study focuses on one aspect of literary criticism, that of literary techniques and structures, and studies what it can tell us about other literary aspects such as plot, character and point of view; and then from the literary understanding moves to questions of meaning or theology. The procedure is in a sense arbitrary: one can enter the circle of literary criticism at any point. The means of literary expression are used in order to convey the content and meaning of the text; the content and meaning are expressed through techniques and structures.

The model for this study, then, is one particular branch of literary criticism: the study of literary techniques and structure. In Biblical research, the model has been used to advantage especially in the work of two groups of scholars: in the Old Testament field, the "rhetorical criticism" advocated and practiced by James Muilenburg and his students,[12] and second, the unlabeled literary approach practiced in particular by such Catholic scholars as I. de La Potterie, Albert

---

[12] For Muilenburg's practice of literary criticism, see, for example, "The Literary Character of Isaiah 34," JBL 49 (1940) 339-365; "Introduction and Exegesis to Isaiah, Chapters 40-66," IB, Vol. V., pp. 381-773; "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations, VT 9 (1959) 347-365. For the work of some of his students, see George P. Ridout, "Prose Techniques" and Jared J. Jackson and Martin Kessler, eds., Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg, (Pittsburgh cheological Monograph Series No. 1; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1974).

Vanhoye, J. Lambrecht, and N. Lohfink, who have been associated with the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome.[13]

James Muilenburg set forth his program in his presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1968, "Form Criticism and Beyond."[14] He describes the method as follows:

> What I am interested in, above all, is in understanding the nature of Hebrew literary composition, in exhibiting the structural patterns that are employed for the fashioning of a literary unit, whether in poetry or prose, and in discerning the many and various devices by which the predications are formulated and ordered into a unified whole. Such an enterprise I should describe as rhetoric and the methodology as rhetorical criticism.[15]

The first aim of his method is to define the limits or scope of the literary unit.[16] The second concern is:

> ...to recognize the structure of a composition and to discern the configuration of its component parts, to delineate the warp and woof out of which the literary fabric is woven, and to note the various rhetorical devices that are employed for marking, on the one hand, the sequence and movement of the periocpe, and on the other, the shifts or breaks in the development of the writer's thought.[17]

Muilenburg states the aim of the enterprise as follows:

> And this leads me to formulate a canon which should be obvious to us all: a responsible and proper

---

[13] See these authors' works cited below and in the bibliography.

[14] JBL 88 (1969) 1-18. [15] Ibid., p. 8. [16] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

[17] Ibid., p. 10.

> articulation of the words in their linguistic patterns and in their precise formulations will reveal to us the texture and fabric of the writer's thought, not only what it is that he thinks, but as he thinks it.[18]

Muilenburg's call to build upon the generalizations and classifications of form criticism and go beyond to "the actuality of the particular text"[19] can apply as well to the New Testament as to the Old. And in markan studies, as in the Old Testament, the rhetorical approach to the final text must build upon the general understanding of forms gained in form critical research.

The work of Albert Vanhoye on the Epistle to the Hebrews[20] serves as a good example of the method, purpose and results typical of the Catholic literary scholarship and as a partial model for this study. Vanhoye first identifies the structure of the letter and its subdividison through its employment of literary devices such as inclusios, hook words, key words, alternation of genre and extensive symmetrical arrangements.[21] The analysis of the structure of the individual parts of the letter constitutes the major portion of the work.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 7. [19] Ibid., p. 18.

[20] La Structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963) and his accompanying A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews (trans. from the Greek and the French by James Swetnam. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964). A good brief description of the method may be found in Addison G. Wright, "The Riddle of the Sphinx: The Structure of the Book of Qoheleth," CBQ 30 (1968) 318-319.

[21] Structure littéraire, pp. 37-59.

The book concludes with a discussion of the interrelationship of the major sections, and of the literary structure of the epistle as the framework or backbone of the thought of the epistle. The method, Vanhoye concludes, is justified by its results:

> L'etude de la structure s'est avérée très utile pour l'exégèse de l'Épître. Elle a permis d'en saisir le mouvement d'ensemble et de discerner l'importance relative des divers développements. Elle doit normalement contribuer à la solution de bien des difficultés et plus encore à la mise en valuer des richesses contenues dans le texte.
>
> Elle ne peut, assurement, se substituer aux autres recherches, philologiques, historiques, théologiques. Son rôle est seulement de leur assurer des bases plus solides.[22]

The aim of this study of the literary techniques and structure of portions of the gospel of Mark could be stated in very similar terms: it is useful for exegesis, for understanding the interrelationships of material, for solving some difficulties and exhibiting some of the richness of the text. The literary study does not seek to replace either historical or theological studies of the gospel of Mark; it hopes rather to provide them with a solid base.

Research on Mark from a literary-historical perspective. Edward C. Hobbs suggested as early as 1956 that the model for a commentary explicating the meaning of an evangelist might well be found "among the interpretations of great literary works such as Shakespeare's plays, or Sophocles' Oedipus, or even the work of James Joyce."[23] In 1966, Leander Keck wrote, "it is clear that much more attention must be paid to the relation between the structure of Mark's thought and the structure of his text."[24] Norman Perrin suggested in 1971 an approach via the insights of general literary criticism, albeit somewhat apologetically:

---

[22] Ibid., p. 259.

> The Gospel of Mark is after all a literary text, and it should be therefore interpreted according to the canons of literary criticism. The evangelist Mark may not be an author in the conscious and sophisticated sense of a William Shakespeare, Henry Fielding, or James Joyce, but he is an author, he has written a literary work.[25]

In 1976, Perrin called unequivocally for a literary-critical approach to Mark.[26]

As yet, however, work on Mark from a literary-rhetorical perspective has been limited. There has always been the occasional scholar who has used a literary approach. James Hardy Ropes' little work on the synoptic gospels published in 1934 is still well worth reading.[27] Austin Farrer's work certainly should be mentioned.[28] In his study of Mark, he posits elaborate recurring primarily symbolic patterns. While his method is too subjective and uncontrolled for his results to be convincing, many of his individual insights are brilliant.

---

[23] "A Different Approach to the Writing of Commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels," A Stubborn Faith: Papers on Old Testament and Related Subjects Presented to Honor William Andrew Irwin. (Ed. Edward C. Hobbs; Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1956), p. 161.

[24] "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel," NTS 12 (1965-66) 369.

[25] "The Christology of Mark," p. 176.

[26] "The Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark," Int. 30 (1976) 115-124.

The most work has been done in the attempt to determine the overall structure of the gospel. Notable recent attempts have been made by R. Pesch,[29] N. Perrin,[30] I. de La Potterie,[31] E. Schweizer,[32] and E. Trôcme.[33] There is considerable but by no means absolute agreement among them as to the major divisions of Mark. There is sometimes less agreement on the method of determining major breaks in Mark, which vary from stichometric counting (Pesch) through observations of literary devices, to strict theological schemes and combinations of the above. Since the overall structure of Mark's gospel is outside the scope of this study, the details of the debate need not be considered.

---

[27] The Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934).

[28] A Study in St Mark (London: Dacre Press, 1951); St Matthew and St Mark (London: Dacre Prexs, 1954).

[29] Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13. (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1968). For a summary of others' divisions, see pp. 48-53; for his own structure, see pp. 53-73.

[30] "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark." (Ed. Hans Dieter Betz; Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage. Claremont, California: New Testament Colloquium, 1971), pp. 1-78; The New Testament: An Introduction (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974), pp. 146-147.

[31] "De compositione Evangelii Marci." VD 44 (1966) 135-141.

[32] The Good News According to Mark. (Trans. by Donald H. Madvig; Richmond: Virginia: John Knox Press, 1970), Table of Contents and passim.

[33] The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark. (Trans. by Pamela Gaughan; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.) For a summary of others' major divisions, see pp. 74-80; for his own structure, see pp. 80-86.

Two points, however, are worth noting. The fact that critics have used both literary and theological criteria reflects the close relationship between literary means and content; they cannot exist without each other. Second, the difficulty of scholars in reaching agreement about certain major breaks may not be the result of different methods or different levels of skill among the scholars. It may instead be due to our attempt to superimpose upon the gospel of Mark a single more rigid structure than the gospel possesses. Patterns and structures may overlap; sections may be transitional; major sections may not all be of about the same length; there may be no major structural break in Mark 6.

Productive research has also begun to be carried out on the rhetorical structure of individual sections of the gospel. Such work has centered on the middle portion of the gospel, with its threefold repetition of the pattern of passion prediction, misunderstanding of the disciples, teaching on discipleship,[34] and on sections of the gospel over which interpretation is most divided--for example, Mk 13.[35] Occasional articles have appeared on other sections of the gospel. Many sections of the gospel, however, have yet to be studied in detail from the point of view of structure or rhetoric.

---

[34] Perrin, "Towards an Interpretation," pp. 7-13; The New Testament, pp. 155-158; La Potterie, "De compositione;" Stein, "Methodology," pp. 192-193.

Practically no work has been done in the area of Mark's literary expression as an indication of how Mark intended the gospel to be read. An exception is Vanhoye's excellent short pamphlet, Structure and Theology of the Accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels.[36] He states his intention as follows:

> We propose to examine the literary composition of the accounts of the three synoptics in order to discern the principal orientation of each of them. A study of this type offers to be of obvious doctrinal and pastoral interest, for it ought to help us place ourselves more faithfully in the perspectives of the inspired authors.[37]

This is a statement very close in meaning if not style to Muilenberg's statement of purpose.[38]

---

[35] Jan Lambrecht, "La structure de Mc 13," ed. I. de La Potterie De Jésus aux Évangiles, (BETL 25:2; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1967), pp. 141-164; Pesch, Naherwartungen, pp. 74-82; Anitra B. Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles, Suffering and Eschatology," George MacRae, ed., 1973 Seminar Papers (SPLASP 109; Missoula, Montana: 1973) Vol. 2, pp. 175-176.

[36] Trans. C.H. Giblin; Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1967; first published in NRT, 1967.

[37] Ibid., p. 5.

Vanhoye briefly surveys the narrative progression of the passion accounts. He does not try to unravel the many narrative difficulties of the text. Rather he sees lack of explanation as characteristic of Mark's style, and what information is given is often "less to explain the facts than to underline the paradoxical and shocking features of the scene."[39] For example, the fact that according to Mark the false witnesses do not agree, does not raise for Vanhoye the logical problem of how could prearranged testimony fail to agree. Rather, the point of the designation of the witnesses as "false" heightens the contrast and paradox. Even employing false witnesses, no "legitimate" grounds can be found against Jesus.[40]

Selection of Material for Analysis

Ideally a literary-rhetorical analysis of the gospel of Mark would cover the entire gospel. For only when we have detailed analyses of the literary techniques and structures of all the individual parts of the gospel will we be in a position to truly grasp Mark's overall structure. Only then will we be able to see the varieties of literary techniques that are employed and the different ways they function.

---

[38] See above, pp. 15-16.

[39] Structure and Theology, p. 10. William L. Lane (Commentary on the Gospel of Mark [NICNT; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1974], pp. 27-28) also stresses Mark's use of contrast as a means of sharpening the issues and forcing the reader to choose sides.

[40] Structure and Theology, pp. 14-15.

Such an undertaking, with all its detailed analysis of the text, is obviously beyond the scope of one dissertation. Detailed study of literary techniques and structure must be limited to selected portions of the gospel so that the investigation is reduced to manageable proportions. The rhetorical method with its focus on literary structure indicates that a block of contiguous material should be selected, rather than a series of isolated texts chosen on the basis of form or content. Since this study attempts to test the usefulness of a method which moves from literary techniques to structure, and only then from the literary understanding to theology, it seems preferable to select a section which is not a center of controversy for determining Mark's theology. The method may well prove most valuable as an aid in interpreting controversial sections such as Mark 13. However, the rhetorical approach should first be tested on material whose meaning appears fairly self-evident.

The Galilean public debate section,[41] Mark 2:1-3:6, is an appropriate text for detailed analysis. It consists of five pericopes, the healing of the paralytic, the eating with tax collectors and sinners, the question about fasting, the plucking of grain on the sabbath, and the healing of the withered hand on the sabbath. The text is of suitable length and it is not a major focus of debate in markan scholarship.

---

[41] Public debate, as used in this study, is a description of content, open debate between Jesus and those who are not disciples, usually opponents. By designating the material Galilean (or Jerusalem), I am referring only to its location in Mark's geographical outline. I am not asserting anything about the provenance of the material.

Further, while 2:1-3:6 consists primarily of public controversy material--what Martin Albertz calls Streitgespräche, or Bultmann, in his larger system of classification, controversy apophthegms--it also includes materials which are not, form-critically speaking, controversy apophthegms. Mark 2:1-12, the healing of the paralytic, has generally been considered a mixed form containing a miracle story and a controversy apophthegm. Mark 2:13 is one of the ten passages identified by K.L Schmidt as markan Sammelberichte.[42] Mark 2:14, the call of Levi, is a biographical apophthegm. The controversy over fasting in 2:18-20 has appended sayings in vv. 21-22. The incident of plucking grain on the sabbath contains two different dominical answers, one in vv. 25-26, and another in vv. 27-28. The text of 2:1-3:6 has an obvious topical and form-critical unity, yet it presents a sufficient variety of material for analysis.

Moreover, as a test of the value of a rhetorical approach, the Galilean controversy section has much to recommend itself. It has been argued, and many scholars have agreed, that Mark has incorporated a pre-existing controversy collection. The theory has been put forward in order to explain apparent difficulties in the material, the atypical use of the title, Son of man, and the too early mentions of

---

[42] Der Rahmen der geschichte Jesus (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919), p. 82.

Jesus' death in the bridegroom allusion in 2:20, and of the plot against Jesus in 3:6.[43]

Yet, the literary-rhetorical approach assumes that the text can be understood on its own terms, without recourse to external solutions. The extent to which this study can resolve or dissolve the problems that led earlier scholars to hypothesize a premarkan collection, and can understand those issues within the markan framework, to that extent the approach is justified.[44]

The Jerusalem public debate section in Mark 11-12 is a suitable text for comparison with 2:1-3:6. Like 2:1-3:6, it consists primarily of public debate material: the question on authority, the questions on tribute, the resurrection, and the great commandment, and the question about David's son (11:27-33; 12:13-37). It is the second major block of such material in the gospel.[45] As scholars have proposed a premarkan source to explain difficulties in 2:1-3:6, so also scholars have proposed external solutions to explain difficulties in Mark 11-12.[46] The public debate material in Mark 11-12 presents a challenge to the rhetorical critic to see if the material can be explained in terms of the markan literary framework.

---

[43] Martin Albertz, Die synoptischen Streitgespräche (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1921), p. 5.

[44] That something can be understood in the markan framework does not exclude the possibility that Mark is also using a source or earlier tradition.

[45] Public debate, however, does occur elsewhere in Mark, in Mk 3:22-30; 7:1-13; and 10:2-9.

[46] See below, pp. 108-111.

In addition, the Jerusalem section poses a different problem from 2:1-3:6 in terms of determining structure. Mark 2:1-3:6 clearly constitutes a coherent literary unit within Mark's gospel. The entire section is dominated by the theme of the Pharisees' hostility to the acts of Jesus or his disciples, culminating in their decision to plot to destroy Jesus (3:6). Further, the section is sharply set off from its surrounding context which displays Jesus' popularity with the crowd. The public debate material in Mark 11-12 is not an obvious rhetorical unit. The parable of the wicked tenants (12:1-12) interrupts the sequence of debates. Moreover, the debate on the first commandment is a school debate containing no hint of conflict (12:28-34); and the saying about David's son is not in response to any question of opponents (12:35-37). Further, the debate material is followed by the warning against the scribes and the story of the widow's mite (12:38-44), before a new section of the gospel begins in Mark 13. Finally, one cannot discuss the material in 11:27-12:37 without also discussing the temple cleansing in Mark 11:15-18. Although not a controversy in form, it clearly resulted in controversy.

Thus, unlike 2:1-3:6, the first task of a rhetorical critic in regard to the public debate material in Mark 11-12 is to establish the limits of rhetorical units larger than the pericope. The entire pattern of the Jerusalem public ministry must first be surveyed to determine if there are any rhetorical substructures in the Jerusalem section, to see how the public debates fit in, and to see if an analysis of rhetorical structure will provide clues about the function of the public debate material in the Jerusalem ministry.

The major portion of the following study is devoted to Mark 2:1-3:6 as a test case for the rhetorical method. Mark 11-12 will be studied much more briefly, to indicate how the rhetorical method may help clarify its structure and the role of the public debate material within it.

Building on Previous Research

As has been noted, relatively little work from a literary-rhetorical perspective has been done on Mark, and virtually none has been done on the public debate material. That does not mean that this study begins with a clean slate. It is grounded in and builds on the results of research on Mark using other methodologies. The efforts of source critics have provided us with the basic picture of Mark's style. The form critics have provided us with the description of the "typical" controversy story form from which we can see how the actual forms occurring in the text of Mark deviate. The redaction critics have added to our knowledge of Mark's style and literary techniques, by their use of them as indices to Mark's redactional activity and theological concerns. All three groups of critics, but particularly the redaction critics with their interest in markan composition and structure, have added to our knowledge of how Mark created (or compiled) his gospel.

The work of these scholars will be briefly surveyed, as it is relevant to the following study under the topics of style, literary techniques, how Mark composed his gospel, and form. But first the presuppositions about the gospel of Mark which underlie a literary-rhetorical approach will be enumerated. For they are presuppositions that have emerged and been confirmed by the work of source, form, and redaction critics.

Presuppositions

The methodological approach of rhetorical criticism is based on three suppositions about the gospel of Mark which are generally or increasingly accepted by markan scholars today:

First, Mark is a compiler. He uses, interprets and orders into a connected narrative already existing traditions which consisted largely of isolated stories and sayings.

Second, contra Bultmann, Mark is in fact master of his material. He is an author in his own right using and developing his materials to present his own point of view or theology, even if we as scholars do not agree on what that is. This supposition is an important one, for it means that all of the text of Mark may be used to interpret Mark's theology. (Where we can ascertain how Mark has modified or developed tradition, we have clues as to how Mark's theology differs from other theological understandings of the time. This can sharpen our grasp of Mark's purpose, but not necessarily of his theology. For his theology cannot be restricted to areas of disagreement with others.)

Finally, the gospel of Mark, however inelegant its Greek, and however far it falls short of classical literary standards, is a literary composition and the study of it as such provides us with an additional methodology for understanding this gospel.

Style

The basic picture of Mark's style emerges from the work of the early commentators, such as Swete and Lagrange, and above all from the quantitative compilation of Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*.[47] The gospel, although one-third shorter than either Matthew or Luke, tends to be wordy in the material it does relate, containing vivid but inessential details, and is frequently pleonastic. The style is simple, with preference for the connective καί and the use of the historic present, and occasionally crude or harsh.

This basic picture of Mark's style has remained largely intact, with details added by later scholars. C.H. Turner, in his excellent series of articles in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1924-1928, has described Mark's use of the impersonal plural in place of the passive voice, his use of auxiliary and quasi-auxiliary verbs with a participle for the imperfect, and the characteristic use of ἄρχομαι plus an infinitive. Turner further describes as a markan characteristic fondness for parenthetical construction. In his list of markan parentheses, he includes examples varying in size from Mark's aside to the reader in 7:2 (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις) to the Old Testament citation in Mk 1:2-3 as a parenthetical interposition into 1:1-4, to the intercalation of the Beelzebub contoversy (3:22-30) into Mark

---

[47] Henry Barclay Swete, *The Gospel according to St Mark*, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1913); Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc*, 5th ed. (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1929); John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909).

3:20-35.[48]

Max Zerwick, in his Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil,[49] confirms Mark's fondness for parentheses, while suggesting it might be helpful to distinguish between true parentheses and larger insertions.[50] Zerwick also studies Mark's use of καί and δέ, his use of tenses and of word order. He points out the frequency of chiastic word order and what he calls chiastic rhythm in phrases, noting that they could have been found in the tradition or be due to Mark.[51]

Frans Neirynck has documented exhausitvely Mark's fondness for pleonasms, redundancies, and repetitions, classifying them according to thirty different categories.[52]

K.L. Schmidt observed that in contrast to the overall vividness of the gospel, there are passages which are colorless and devoid of particulars.[53] These he calls Sammelberichte, and believes them to be markan compositions. Josef Schmid has emphasized that Mark is by no means always wordy. Such to us theologically important events as the call of the disciples or the institution of the last supper are presented concisely, even sketchily, in contrast to the wealth of detail in reporting such incidents as the miracles in Mark 5:1-43 or the death of John the Baptist in Mark 6:14-29.[54]

---

[48] "Marcan Usage," JTS 26 (1925) 145-156.

[49] Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1937.

[50] Ibid., pp. 131-132.

[51] Ibid., pp. 125-126.

[52] Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1972), pp. 75-136.

[53] Rahmen, pp. 33, 82, 105, 108. Vincent Taylor agrees that lack of picturesequeness is a sign of markan composition (The Gospel According to St. Mark, 2nd ed. [London: Macmillan, 1966], pp. 82-83.) Martin Dibelius ("The Structure and Literary Character of the Gospels,"

Though our knowledge of the details of Mark's style has grown since Hawkins' day, the general picture remains much the same. This is easily seen by reading Hawkins and then reading Vincent Taylor's excellent summary of Mark's style in his commentary[55] or reading Ernst Haenchen's description in his.[56]

Literary techniques

The line between style and literary technique is an indistinct one. The repetitiousness so thoroughly listed by Neirynck in many instances may be precisely a stylistic fondness for repetition. But when Neirynck concludes that "progressive double-step expression" is a

---

HTR 20 (1927) 158-160) also calls attention to a "novelle" style and a less vivid "edification" style.

[54] The Gospel According to Mark (trans. Kevin Condon; RNT; Staten Island: The Society of St. Paul, 1968), p. 12.

[55] Mark, pp. 44-66.

[56] Der Weg Jesu, (Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1966), pp. 29-37. See also Nigel Turner, Style (Vol. 4 of James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976]), pp. 11-30.

general characteristic of Mark's manner of writing and editing,[57] he is making an assertion about Mark's literary technique or method of composition.

So also Mark's fondness for parentheses may vary from a stylistic quirk to a literary device to interrelate extended blocks of material. While C.H. Turner and Zerwick were describing these as aspects of stylistic preference, Ernst von Dobschütz was studying them as literary devices.[58] He described two techniques; first, true "sandwiching" or intercalation such as is found in Mk 5:21-43 and 14:1-11, which functions both to create an illusion of time or distance and to heighten the tension for the hearer. The second technique is to point to a second story at the beginning of the first in order to bring them into some inner connection, e.g., 3:20-35, 14:54-72. What the actual inner connection is, varies according to the example: in Mark 3:20-35, it is to emphasize the contrast between the friendliness of the relatives and the hostility of the scribes;[59] in 14:54-72, it is a device to indicate the simultaneity of Peter's denial and Jesus' trial.

Dobschütz' interest in literary devices as a way of understanding Mark's literary expression was unusual for his time. Commentators have always mentioned in passing the markan "sandwiches" or intercalations but they have viewed them mainly as an elementary technique to indicate passage of time. Werner G. Kümmel lists only three devices as characteristic of Mark: 1) intercalation or sandwiching; 2) preparation of the reader in advance (e.g., mentioning the boat in 3:9 to prepare for 4:1); and 3) the addition of summary reports (_Sammelberichte_).[60]

---

[57] Duality, pp. 71-72.

[58] "Zur Erzählerkunst des Markus," ZNW 27 (1928) 193-198.

[59] Cf. Benjamin Wisner Bacon (The Beginnings of the Gospel Story [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1909], p. 42) who sees the point of the intertwining as the contrast between the minor crime of the family and the major crime of the scribes.

Literary techniques become a real focus of attention only with the rise of redaction criticism. For they offer a possible avenue for the redaction critic to ascertain Mark's editorial activity and/or his theological concerns. The literary devices most mentioned have been circular or symmetrical ones: the long-familiar "sandwiches" or intercalations, insertions, and framing techniques.

Intercalations.[61] Robert Stein is conservative in his estimate of the usefulness of the intercalations for determining Mark's theological concerns. For if "both incidents took place at the same time or were located in the same place," or if they deal with a similar theme, the intertwining may be irrelevant for markan thought. Only if it can be demonstrated that one pericope helps to interpret the other are sandwiches of theological interest.[62] Stein fails to see (or agree) that the device of intercalating episodes by definition brings them into some literary relationship with each other. It is the job of the rhetorical critic to determine in each instance what the function of the intercalation is--to indicate passage of time, to retard the action in order to heighten dramatic tension, for emphasis, contrast--and then to see how that helps to understand the meaning (theology) of the text.

---

[60] _Introduction to the New Testament_, 14th rev. ed. (trans. A.J. Mattil, Jr.; Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 64.

[61] The following passages are generally considered intercalations: Mark 3:20-35; 5:21-43; 6:7-32; 11:12-26; 14:1-11. Sometimes 14:12-25 and 54-72 are also included.

Other redaction critics have not been as cautious as Stein. T.A. Burkill, for example, sees Mark using them as a literary means either to stress a parallel or make a contrast.[63] John R. Donahue has perhaps tried to carry the direct theological significance of intercalations the farthest. He affirms that "there is a dialectical relationship between the inserted material and its framework whereby the stories serve to interpret each other."[64] He then goes on to try to establish a systematic theological pattern that applies to all the intercalations.[65] Donahue concludes that "sections leading to the suffering and death of

---

[62] "Methodology," pp. 193-194.

[63] Mysterious Revelation (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963), p. 121, fn. 10.

[64] The Christ, p. 52. I would agree that there is some relationship between the intercalated material and its framework.

[65] Ibid., pp. 58-63. He excludes Mk 5:21-43 which he believes Mark may have found in the tradition, but includes the other six listed in fn. 61.

Jesus are framed by discipleship material," and therefore, "Mark uses the technique of intercalation to underscore two major themes of his gospel, the way of suffering of Jesus, and the necessity of the disciple to follow Jesus on this way."[66] That these are major themes in Mark is undeniable. But Donahue appears to force the interpretation of passages in order to make the intercalations fit his theological pattern. For example, in 3:20-35, the inner story does describe the scribes' hostility to Jesus' healings, but Jesus triumphantly answers his opponents and the incident contains no hint of the coming suffering.

More basically, Donahue's use of literary techniques as a direct indicator of theology ignores the reality of the gospel as narrative. Intercalation is primarily a literary device and should be studied first in rhetorical terms, to see how the intercalation affects the progression of the narrative. Only when its literary function is understood, can one correctly interpret how an intercalation may add to our understanding of Mark's theology. Further, intercalations may function differently from each other.[67]

Insertions. Stein and Donahue, among other redaction critics, have called attention to "insertion" as a markan literary technique.

---

[66] Ibid., p. 62.

[67] Howard Clark Kee in his recent work (Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977], pp. 54-56), includes 2:1-12; 3:1-6 and 15:6-32 along with the intercalations as examples of Mark's interpolation technique. He views interpolation technique serving different functions--Mark's literary, practical or dogmatic aims.

Insertions might be defined as smaller editions of intercalations. Instead of one pericope being inserted within another, something in some way foreign is "inserted" into one pericope. Stein sees them as Mark's way of commenting on a tradition to the reader, therefore as important to Mark's theology. He uses the examples of Mk 14:28 and 16:7.[68] Donahue attempts to establish criteria for identifying "insertions": a) close verbal agreement in the material framing the insertion; b) redundant quality to one of those phrases; and c) synoptic alteration.[69] According to Donahue, Mark uses this technique to call attention to the inserted verse: "much in the same fashion that a modern writer would use italics or an asterisk."[70] The inserted material gives "an added dimension" to the narrative into which it is inserted.[71] Donahue's definition of an insertion is useful. And here, at least in his appendix listing markan insertions, Donahue appears to approach the use of the device less rigidly and from a more literary perspective:

> Continued study of this phenomenon in Mark has convinced me that it is a very important compositional technique used by Mark for a variety of functions, and not simply to call attention to the "inserted" material.[72]

Framing techniques. The outside material of both intercalations and insertions can be called "framing" material. Scholars have noticed that Mark will also frame larger blocks of material. The two stories of the healing of blind men frame the midsection of the gospel which centers on the themes of christology and discipleship.[73] The first healing of a blind man and the healing of the epileptic boy form an inner frame around the extended concentric structure of 8:27-9:13.[74] In the following rhetorical analyses other framing materials besides miracle stories will be noticed.

---

[68] "Methodology," p. 184. [69] The Christ, p. 241.

[70] Ibid., p. 81. [71] Ibid., pp. 83-84. [72] Ibid., p. 241.

As matters of style at some point pass over into literary techniques, so also at some point, such as frames around an extended concentric structure, literary techniques become Mark's methods of putting his gospel together.

How Mark put the gospel together

If our conception of Mark's style has remained much the same since our first investigation of it, our picture of the extent of Mark's editorial activity and of his sophistication as a writer has changed drastically. We still accept K.L. Schmidt's conclusion that Mark has strung together many individual stories.[75] We still agree with Bultmann's description of markan techniques for linking materials: 1) simple linking in succession above all with the connective καί, sometimes εὐθύς or πάλιν;[76] 2) the use of spatial and temporal links; 3) the occasional expanded transitions or situation indications which correspond more or less to Schmidt's *Sammelberichte*; and 4) the use of motifs such as the lake, boat, house, mountain, disciples, crowds, opponents, motifs which Mark found in individual pieces of tradition and then used to incorporate other pieces of tradition.[77] But we no longer see these as the simple or simple-minded techniques of a not very adept compiler.

---

[73] See above, p. 20, fn. 34.

[74] René Lafontaine & Pierre Mourlon Beernaert, "Essai sur la structure de Marc 8,27-9,13," RSR 57 (1969) 543-561.

[75] Rahmen, pp. 17, 317.

Johannes Sundwall's excellent study, *Die Zusammensetzung des Markusevangeliums* (1934) is the only detailed literary study of how each pericope is fitted into its place in the text.[78] He pays particular attention to word repetitions, and observes the great frequency of catchwords between pericopes, words that recall what has gone before, and bracket words occurring at the beginning and end of pericopes. He believes that these word repetition techniques were common in the oral tradition available to Mark, which Mark took over and greatly expanded, in order to bind his gospel together.[79] Sundwall's observations are the starting point for any literary analysis of the composition of the text. Sundwall, however, did not look beyond the immediate connections between individual pericopes or premarkan collections to possible larger structural patterns in Mark.

---

[76] Cf. G.D. Kilpatrick who argues convincingly that πάλιν is an adverb, not a connecting particle. ("Some Notes on Marcan Usage," *The Bible Translator* 7 [1956] p. 4.)

[77] *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), pp. 339-343.

[78] Abo: Abo Akademi. [79] Ibid., pp. 3-6.

For we no longer assume that the gospel of Mark contains no more elaborate structures than the simple linking of episodes in succession. The midsection, 8:27-10:45, clearly is structured around the threefold repetition of the pattern: passion prediction--misunderstanding of the disciples--teaching on discipleship. Various structures, more or less elaborate, have been proposed for Mark 13. Extended concentric structures have been observed by various people in many sections of the gospel.[80] The analysis of markan structures is an ongoing activity of scholars at present. It is evident, however, that in many if not all parts of the gospel, pericopes are organized into larger wholes or structures which serve to interrelate the material.

We also no longer agree with Schmidt, Bultmann and Taylor that Mark was a simple compiler who abstained from much if any editorial work on the traditional material itself.[81] As a result of the studies of redaction critics, we now conclude that Mark has made extensive editorial modifications within individual pericopes, and in the passion narrative.[82] We have come to believe that far more of the pericopes than just the Sammelberichte were composed by Mark. Mark is truly an author as well as an editor.

---

[80] See below, pp. 252-253.

[81] Schmidt, Rahmen, p. 209; Bultmann, History, p. 332; Taylor, Mark, pp. 112-113.

Form

The relevance of previous research on Mark's style, literary techniques, and methods of composition to a rhetorical analysis of the markan text is self-evident. The relevance of form criticism is less evident, for the aims of the rhetorical critic and the form critic are different. The form critic seeks to discover the typical forms in which the synoptic material clothed itself in the oral tradition; he/she attempts to dissolve the final text into its constituent elements, one or more originally independent traditions, later accretions, editorial additions and emendations; the form critic seeks to determine the Sitz im Leben of the form or its particular exemplar. The rhetorical critic, on the other hand, is not concerned with the Sitz im Leben or the tradition history of the pericope; he/she seeks to interpret the meaning of the final text, and to understand how each individual element contributes to that text.

Yet, as the above discussion of Muilenburg's approach indicated,[83] rhetorical criticism builds precisely upon an understanding of the typical form. A rhetorical critic uses one of the major results of form critical investigation, the description of the form itself, as a preliminary guide to the literary techniques and structure employed in a text.

---

[82] On the passion narrative, see Donahue, The Christ, and Kelber, ed., The Passion in Mark (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976).

[83] See above, p. 16.

Such a use of form criticism presupposes that Biblical scholars have achieved some agreement on the form lying behind the markan public debate material. And that is indeed the case. The major form-critical works dealing with the controversy material are the monograph of Martin Albertz;[84] the studies of Martin Dibelius[85] and Rudolf Bultmann,[86] the first editions of which were all published about 1920; Vincent Taylor's study, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition,[87] first published in 1933; and Arland J. Hultgren's 1971 dissertation, "Jesus and His Adversaries: A Study of the Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition."[88] The form critics, except for Dibelius, agree that there is a controversy form, however they may choose to name it. And they all, including Dibelius, classify most of Mark's public debate material as belonging to that form.[89]

---

[84] Streitgespräche.

[85] From Tradition to Gospel (trans. Bertram Lee Wolf; New York: Scribner, 1935), pp. 37-69.

[86] History, pp. 11-68.

[87] 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1964, pp. 63-87.

[88] Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1971. See also the useful discussion of a tripartite form by David Daube (The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism [London: Athlone Press, 1956], pp. 170-175).

To state that the form critics agree on the characteristics of the form is true only in the most general sense. They disagree not only on nomenclature but also on some of the defining characteristics and on whether or not certain pericopes belong to it. The following discussion describes the understanding of the form that will underlie the rhetorical analysis, plus a summary of selected aspects of the form critics' thinking which seem particularly useful for the rhetorical critic. No attempt is made to give a comprehensive overview or analysis of the form critics' work on controversy stories.[90]

Hultgren's description. Hultgren's description of the oral form, which he calls "conflict story," seems to be the most adequate description of the material. A conflict story consists of a brief narrative introduction and a "dialogue" between Jesus and his contemporaries, and the latter are depicted as adversaries.[91] It is a "form of narrative and dialogue material showing conflict between Jesus and his adversaries."[92] Hultgren, in agreement with the other form critics, emphasizes the conciseness of the form and the fact that it climaxes in the final saying of Jesus.

---

[89] Dibelius to his "paradigm" form.

[90] An extensive discussion of the views of the various form critics may be found in Hultgren, "Adversaries," pp. 1-71.

[91] Ibid., p. 7. [92] Ibid.

Hultgren has abstracted four formal characteristics of the form: 1) the domincal saying dominates, appearing at the close of the dialogue;[93] 2) the opponent′ question, whether real or imaginary, is of great importance and is sometimes the means whereby material is fashioned into the conflict story form;[94] 3) narrative always precedes the dialogue and may occur in the middle or at the end. At its most concise, the narrative element merely links the story to the preceding pericope and gives a brief setting for the dialogue. When the narrative is more extensive, it is employed to increase the dramatic effect.[95] 4) Finally, the opponents represent one party only--that is, they function as a single character in the conflict story form. "The interchange is between two parties only: Jesus on one side, his opponents (individually or collectively) on the other."[96] The opponents are described only in the most general terms, "sufficient to set up the necessary polarity for the conflict dialogue."[97]

Hultgren′s description of the form seems to fit the synoptic material best because of his consistent emphasis on conflict as an essential ingredient of the form without overspecification of the occasion of conflict[98] or the technique of argumentation. Dibelius, Taylor and Albertz all to varying degrees deny or lose sight of the element of controversy.[99] Bultmann maintains the element of conflict, but in defining the starting point as "some action or attitude which is seized on by the opponent,"[100] and in defining Jesus' argument as one leading the opponent ad absurdum,[101] he defines the material more narrowly than the data warrant.

---

[93] Ibid., pp. 61-64.

[94] Ibid., pp. 64-66. Hultgren acknowledges Mt 22:41-46, Luke 14:106, and Mark 3:1-5 to be exceptions.

[95] Ibid., pp. 67-70. [96] Ibid., p. 70. [97] Ibid.

Albertz' description. Hultgren's definition of the conflict form, although more systematic than Albertz', draws heavily on Albertz' work.[102] Since Albertz' description follows the narrative sequence of the form, it provides the rhetorical critic with convenient categories for analysing the public debate material in Mark's gospel.

According to Albertz, the form consists at most of three parts:

---

[98] Hultgren's statement is quite general: "These opponents question Jesus' conduct, or that of his disciples, seek to entrap or test him, or gather against him" (Ibid., p. 69).

[99] Dibelius denies that dispute is characteristic of his paradigm form (or indeed of any form); even the element of dialogue is quite secondary (Tradition, pp. 68-69). Taylor views the debate leading up to Jesus' saying as part of the pronouncement story, but makes no distinction between debates which are hostile and those which are not (Formation, p. 63). Albertz, in spite of naming his form Streitgespräche, includes all synoptic stories in which Jesus is questioned by other than disciples, whether or not there is any hint of controversy--e.g., Mk 10:17-27; 12:28-34 (Streitgespräche, pp. 25-26, 52-54).

[100] History, p. 39. [101] Ibid., pp. 45, 54.

[102] "Adversaries," p. 55.

the opening exposition, the dialogue, and when present, the closing remarks.[103] The exposition corresponds to Hultgren's narrative elements. It serves to introduce the questioner and prepare for the question.[104] Then follows the dialogue, corresponding to Hultgren's question of the opponents and dominical saying. The dialogue is the focus of interest.[105] In its simplest and most usual form, it is a question followed by Jesus' answer--word and counterword. In a few instances, there is more extended dialogue, ending with Jesus' word. Jesus' final word is the climax of the story. Only in those instances where Jesus' final action is not a word but a healing miracle is the form concluded by closing remarks.[106] Otherwise the story ends with Jesus' word. As Albertz noted, however, the dialogue may consist of more than one interchange between the questioner and Jesus.

The dialogue. All the form critics agree that Jesus' final answer is the climax of the story.[107] As Albertz noted, however, the dialogue may consist of more than one interchange between the questioner and Jesus.[108] C.H. Dodd has posited that a true dialogue form exists which may be distinguished from the apophthegm.[109] He cites five instances in Mark, and two in Luke.[110] According to Dodd, these dialogues differ from the apophthegms in that the intermediate steps of the dialogue are either necessary to the final answer or in themselves constitute at least implicitly the answer. Therefore the questioner is not simply a foil to elicit Jesus′ pronouncement, but a significant contributer to the discussion. The emphasis is not solely on Jesus′ answer. Dodd′s idea of a separate dialogue form has not been generally adopted. His observation, however, that extended dialogue changes the emphasis and balance in a pronouncement story is helpful.

---

[103] Streitgespräche, p. 86. [104] Ibid., pp. 87-91.

[105] Ibid., pp. 6, 19, 91-96. [106] Ibid., pp. 86, 95.

[107] Dibelius, Tradition, p. 56; Bultmann, History, p. 62; Taylor, Formation, p. 63.

[108] Streitgespräche, pp. 93-94.

The occasion and content of the conflict. Bultmann analyzes the controversy apophthegms according to three different categories: those "occasioned by Jesus′ healing," those "otherwise occasioned by the conduct of Jesus or the disciples," and "questions asked by opponents."[111] Although Bultmann does not refer to these categories in his general discussion of controversy and scholastic dialogues, they nonetheless appear to represent real subgroups within the controversy form. A controversy is concerned either with Jesus' healing (on the sabbath, by Beelzebul) or with some other behavior of Jesus or his disciples (eating with tax collectors and sinners, not fasting) or with some question asked Jesus by opponents (about divorce, taxes, resurrection).

---

[109] C.H. Dodd, "The Dialogue Form in the Gospels," BJRL 37 (1954-55) 54-60.

[110] Mk 10:2-9, 17-27, 35-45; 11:27-33, 12:13-17; Lk 7:36-50, 10:25-37.

[111] History, pp. 12-21, 26-27. Bultmann′s fourth category, "The Master is questioned (by disciples or others)," contains the school debates (Ibid., pp. 21-26).

The division reflects the content as much as it does the occasion of the conflict. A healing controversy, for example, is about Jesus' use of his healing power. The division also reflects variations in the controversy form. Bultmann's second category, those to do with some behavior of Jesus or the disciples, generally follows the simple or "typical" form. The exposition provides the setting: some action of Jesus or the disciples. The behavior is questioned, and, in a brief response, Jesus triumphantly justifies it. The pattern is behavior-question-justification.

In Bultmann's third group, questions asked Jesus by opponents, the starting point is not any behavior of Jesus or the disciples. Thus the exposition is usually minimal. The dialogue, however, is generally developed beyond simple question and answer.[112] Here, as Dodd suggests, the emphasis falls on the process of the dialogue, not just on Jesus' final word.

The situation in the first group, controversies in which Jesus' healing plays some role, is more complex. The sabbath healing in Lk 13:10-17 and the Q version behind the Beelzebul controversy (Mt 12:22-37/Lk 11:14-23)[113] follow the pattern of Bultmann's second group: behavior-objection-vindiction. The others, the sabbath healing of Mark 3:1-5 (and par) and the healing/forgiveness dispute of Mark 2:1-12 (and par) do not.[114] The objectionable behavior, the healing, occurs at the end, after Jesus' sayings.[115] This dislocation naturally disturbs the normal dialogue form. Jesus may take the initiative asking the question. And the opponents may remain silent throughout. Thus the synoptic gospels record two healing controversy types: those in which the objectionable healing begins the controversy and those in which the healing comes at the end of the controversy.[116]

---

[112] Extended dialogue is also characteristic of markan school debates.

Thus, in summary, there appear to be three types (or one type and two variants) of the controversy form. The basic form is the action-objection-justification type. The conflict arises out of some behavior of Jesus or the disciples; the opponents question it and Jesus vindicates it. Some but not all of the controversies arising out of Jesus' healing conform to this type. In the first variant the opponents simply question Jesus: there is no preceding objectionable act. In these variants, the dialogue is usually extended. In the second variant, Jesus' objectionable act occurs at the end of the story, after the debate. In this variant, the objectionable behavior is always Jesus' healing activity.

---

[113] The markan Beelzebul controversy, 3:22-30, appears to be a truncated version of the one in Q, omitting the healing altogether.

[114] Lk 14:1-6, a sabbath healing, contains saying material both before and after the healing.

[115] Perhaps Mk 7:24-31 and par. and Mt 8:5-13/Lk 7:1-10 should be included with this group.

[116] The question of whether one or the other healing controversy type is a later or secondary development in the Christian tradition or even due to markan redaction is outside the scope of this discussion.

Literary Techniques

Before turning to the definition of literary techniques, some general issues need to be mentioned. The first issue concerns whether the rhetorical devices are phenomena of oral or written literature. Unquestionably, many if not all of them have their origin in oral literatures.[117] Even extended symmetrical patterns are well documented in oral composition.[118] But they are also techniques which can be used in written composition. And to assert a clear difference between oral and written composition for popular literature in the first century C.E. seems out of place. For even if a work was written, it was meant to be read aloud and to be heard. Most of those who became acquainted with the gospel of Mark undoubtedly heard it read. Thus the distinction between oral and written techniques does not appear applicable from the point of view of the audience.

The second question concerns whether the techniques are basically

---

[117] See Charles H. Lohr, "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," CBQ 23 (1961) 403-435.

[118] Ibid., pp. 424-425.

Greek or Semitic in inspiration. They are, of course, attested in both literatures. Inclusios and hook words are characteristic of virtually all oral literatures studied. Ring composition and chiasm are also to be found in both Greek literature and the Old Testament. But the frequency of extended symmetrical structures, introverted parallelism, in the Old Testament, combined with our knowledge of the extensive influence of the Old Testament on the New in other respects, makes it seem probable that a major influence for such patterns comes from Hebrew rhetoric.[119]

The last general issues are perhaps the most difficult to speculate about with any accuracy. These are the question of how conscious or unconscious an author is of his use of literary techniques and the question of how and to what extent a hearer is consciously or unconsciously aware of or affected by the use of such techniques. The use of inclusios and hook words (catchwords) is so pervasive that an author could use them consciously or unconsciously; and the hearer would probably sense them in terms of completion and transition. Mark's intercalations and insertions seem to be deliberate--but that is only because it is difficult for us to see how they could occur without some deliberate intent. They are sufficiently obvious that it seems safe to assume that the audience would be aware of them also.

---

[119] Cf. Charles H. Talbert (Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts [SBLMS 20; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974], p. 67) who asserts that the principle of balance or duality, his terms for extended symmetries, "has its roots in a discernible Zeitgeist or cultural trait" of the Greek (and Latin) as well as Semitic milieu.

The questions become particularly difficult and also particularly important in regard to extended symmetrical patterns. It is hard to believe that elaborate, elegant concentric structures which have been documented in many literatures occurred without the authors deliberately intending them. Some of the looser structures may have been less fully conscious.[120] The question of if and how the audience was aware of such structures is more difficult to answer. C.H. Talbert, who has perhaps done the most study of the issue, concludes that the greater sensitivity to form in the first century and the widespread existence in literature and art of the principle of balance and symmetry are such that "the architechtonic patterns would have been immediately sensed or felt but not consciously and rationally perceived until after reflection."[121]

Classification and Definition of Literary Techniques

The following is a rough classification and definition of literary devices that appear likely to be found with some frequency in the gospel of Mark. The terminology is basically that in use among biblical scholars, although rhetorical works have been consulted.[122]

---

[120] Talbert argues that authors probably worked from a preliminary sketch (Ibid., p. 79).

[121] Ibid., p. 81. See Talbert's entire discussion (Ibid., pp. 67-81).

[122] The basic work on classical rhetoric is Heinrich Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, 2 vols. (Munich: Max Hueber, 1960). For a useful brief guide to rhetorical terminology, see

Classification of word or phrase repetitions

Inclusio. The repetition of the same word or phrase at or near the beginning and ending of some unit, a sentence, a pericope, or a larger section. The form of the word need not be repeated exactly. For instance, one might find a noun and a verb from the same root. Inclusio is by definition an indication of structure, the beginning and end of a rhetorical unit of any size. It is a recognized technique of oral literatures.[123] So the rhetorical critic by designating certain repetitions as inclusios is making a judgment about the limits of some unit of narrative.

Hook words. The repetition of the same word or phrase in two successive or parallel units, clauses, verses, or pericopes. In the technical terminology of Greek rhetoric,[124] anaphora is the use of hook words at the beginning of each unit, e.g.:

> Fear not, O land; be glad and rejoice,
>   for the Lord has done great things!
> Fear not, you beasts of the field,
>   for the pastures of the wilderness are green.
> (Joel 2:21-22a)

Epiphora is the use of hook words at the end of each unit. Anadiplosis is the repetition of the same word or phrase at the end of one unit and at the beginning of the following one. Hook words may also occur

---

Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

[123] Lohr, "Oral Techniques," pp. 408-409.

[124] See Lausberg, *Handbuch*, Sects. 619, 625, 629, 631.

in the middle of verses or pericopes.

Hook words indicate some structural relationship between the materials they "hook" together. The same statements about variation and the critic's judgment made about inclusios apply to all hook words.[125] The term "hook word"[126] rather than catch word is employed, since it is a more neutral and descriptive term, without catchword's overtones of editorial compilation. Both uses of a hook word or phrase may have been in the tradition, or one or both may be the redactional or compositional activity of Mark.

Key words. In addition to word repetitions which are indicative of structure, a word may be used repeatedly as the leit-motif or theme of a passage or longer section of narrative. Examples are "to fast" in Mark 2:18-20 or "bread" in Mark 6-8. Such key words help to give thematic unity to a narrative, without demarking any structural pattern.[127]

Anticipation and retrospection. A word or phrase may be used to prepare the reader for later events in the narrative, to foreshadow developments to come. The same word or phrase is then used later in the narrative to recall to the reader's mind incidents that have gone before. Such devices help to interconnect the parts of a narrative, to give an episodic work a sense of unity.[128]

---

[125] Inclusio (epanalepsis) is, of course, a particular type of hook word use, use at the beginning and end of some unit. It is treated separately since it indicates the limits of a rhetorical unit. The precise structural implications of other hook word types are not contained in their very definition.

[126] The term "hook word" is borrowed from Vanhoye, Structure littéraire, p. 37, (mot-crochet).

[127] See Lohr, "Oral Techniques," p. 422.

Repetition for rhetorical effect. Word repetition is also frequently employed for rhetorical effect. Repetition may be used to indicate emphasis, as a means of retarding action, or as a way of indicating climax.[129] Repetition may also be used to highlight or stress unrepeated material, new information surrounded by redundancies.

Lack of word repetition. The use of word repetition is so pervasive in the gospel of Mark, that its absence should be observed as well.

Other rhetorical techniques

Chiasm. Chiasm, from the Greek letter chi, means "crossing." In its narrowest sense, it refers to repetition of words in inverted order: a b : b′ a′. As such, or course, it is an instance of word repetition for rhetorical effect. However, chiasm also refers to a broader range of literary devices in which crossing occurs. Syntactical chiasm--e.g., subject, verb: verb, subject--occurs frequently in Mark.

---

[128] On these devices, see ibid., pp. 411-412, 414.

[129] Ridout, "Prose Techniques," pp. 107-119.

A chiasm may also consist of content parallels in inverted order:

> I will pour out my spirit on all flesh:
>   Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,
>   Your old men shall dream dreams,
>   and your young men shall see visions.
>   Even upon the menservants and maidservants
> in those days, I will pour out my spirit. (Joel 2:28-29)

As in the above example, a chiasm may consist of more than two elements. Also a chiasm may contain a middle element which is not repeated: a b c b′ a′. A chiasm may be made up of larger content elements, even of whole pericopes. In such cases, the chiastic elements often contain hook words. The essential feature of all chiasms, of whatever dimension, is that of crossing or inversion.

Ring composition. Ring composition is a circular technique, an a b a pattern. In its simplest form, it is the device of inclusio, the repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning and end of some passage marking it as a rhetorical unit.[130] However, ring composition, like chiasm, may be defined by content rather than verbal repetition and may encompass larger sections of narrative, parts of a pericope or three or more pericopes. As in the case of chiasm, hook words are often employed.

---

[130] Semitic scholars generally use the term inclusio, while classical scholars employ the term ring composition, for the technique called inclusio in this study.

Extended concentric structure. The symmetrical arrangement or introverted parallelism of four, five or more pericopes or items of narrative.[131] An extended concentric pattern may have a single unparalleled element in the middle of it: a b c b′ a′; or it may consist entirely of balanced elements: a b c c′ b′ a′. An extended concentric structure may often contain chiastic elements, and it may often be grouped or collapsed into a ring composition: e.g., (a b) c (b′ a′). Extended symmetrical patterns are recognized by multiple congruent parallelisms, of content, of form and structure, of vocabulary repetitions (hook words), etc. A more extended discussion of such patterns follows the definition of terms.

The foregoing three rhetorical devices are standard terms employed in rhetorical analysis.[132] The following two devices have been arbitrarily named and defined for use in the rhetorical analysis of Mark.

Interposition. A foreign narrative element interposed into a larger narrative. Insertions and intercalations discussed under the review of previous work[133] would both be interpositions. However, the term interposition is a neutral definition of a rhetorical device; it does not imply interpolation or lack thereof. An interposition always breaks in some way with the preceding and following narrative. The central element of a ring composition will be an interposition only if it in some fashion disrupts the natural flow of the narrative.[134] An interposition may be of any size, from the interposition, "And the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom," between Jesus' death on the cross, and the centurion's reaction to that death (15:37-39), to an extended section of narrative. Longer interpositions are often marked off by a frame.

---

[131] Strictly speaking, an arrangement of four narrative units is an extended chiasm.

[132] Chiasm and ring composition are standard terms in classical scholarship, although neither was employed by the ancient rhetoricians. See Lausberg, Handbuch, Sects. 723, fn. 1, 800-803. Extended concentric structures, under varying nomenclature, have been described in many literatures.

Frame. A frame is defined as something that frames another unit at its beginning and end, but which itself is not part of the unit framed. For example, the two healings of blind men constitute a frame for Mark 8:27-10:45, but the two miracle-controversies beginning and ending Mark 2:1-3:6 are not a frame because they themselves are part of the controversy section.

Extended Concentric Structures

Some further preliminary observations about detailed or extended symmetrical structures need to be made. For unlike the other literary techniques described, the technique is not familiar to us either from our general knowledge of rhetoric, ancient or modern, or as a specific literary technique of Mark's. Furthermore, the structure is discerned by the twentieth century reader only through detailed study of the text. One wonders if the structure is not the brainchild of some twentieth century critic determined to obfuscate matters.

---

[133] See above, pp. 33-36.

[134] For example, Mk 3:1-6 is a ring composition, but vv. 3-5a are not an interposition. See below, p. 189.

If it is the latter, we may be said to have that type of obfuscation on the brain. Scholars are identifying symmetrical structures, introversion, structure by envelopment, and extended chiasms in a wide variety of literatures.[135] In classical literature, it has been found in Homer,[136] Herodotus,[137] and Vergil[138] among others. In biblical literature, the question is becoming, where is it not found?

---

[135] Discussions of the technique and many additional references may be found in Lohr, "Oral Techniques," pp. 424-427; Talbert, "Artistry and Theology: An Analysis of the Architecture of Jn 1,19-5,47," CBQ 32 (1970) 341-366; Talbert, Literary Patterns, esp. pp. 67-88; Vanhoye, Structure littéraire, pp. 60-64.

[136] J.T. Sheppard, The Pattern of the Iliad (London: Methuen, 1922); John L. Myres, "The Pattern of the Odyssey," JHS 72 (1952) 1-19; Cedric H. Whitman, Homer and the Heroic Tradition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), esp. pp. 249-309.

[137] Myres, Herodotus: Father of History (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), esp. pp. 81-91; Ingrid Beck, Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik (New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1971).

[138] George E. Duckworth, "The Architecture of the Aeneid," American Journal of Philology 75 (1954) 1-15; Duckworth, Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962).

It has been recognized in Hebrew prose[139] and poetry:[140] in the creation stories in Genesis,[141] in Deuteronomy,[142] in the court succession narrative,[143] in Jeremiah,[144] Zephaniah[145] and Zechariah,[146] in

---

[139] Yehuda T. Radday, "Chiasm in Samuel," Linguistica Biblica 9/10 (1971) 21-31; "Chiasm in Tora," Linguistica Biblica 19 (1972) 12-23; "Chiasm in Joshua, Judges and Others," Linguistica Biblica 27/28 (1973) 6-13; "Chiasm in Kings," Linguistica Biblica 31 (1974) 52-67; Angelico Di Marco, "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel 1. Teil," Linguistica Biblica 36 (1975) 21-97; Di Marco, "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel: 2. Teil," Linguistica Biblica 37 (1976) 49-68.

[140] Luis Alonso-Schökel, "Poésie Hébraïque," (DBSup 8; Paris, 1972), esp. cols. 85-90; Estudios de Poética Hebrea (Barcelona: Juan Flors, 1963), esp. pp. 323-335.

[141] Phyllis Trible, "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," JAAR 41 (1973), pp. 35-36, 42 fn. 53.

[142] Norbert Lohfink, Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11 (AnBib 20; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), pp. 182, 194-195.

[143] Ridout, "Prose Techniques," pp. 47-74.

[144] Jack R. Lundbom, Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric (SBLDS 18; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 61-112.

[145] Ivan Jay Ball, Jr., "A Rhetorical Study of Zephaniah" (Th.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1972).

[146] Paul Lamarche, Zacharie IX-XIV. Structure littéraire et messianisme. (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1961); esp. pp. 105-123.

Jonah[147] and Ruth,[148] in Psalms,[149] Proverbs,[150] Song of Songs,[151] and Lamentations.[152] The Aramaic section of Daniel has a concentric pattern.[153] It has been observed in the Hodoyat of Qumran.[154] It has been suggested as one of the organizing techniques of the rabbis for the oral haggadah.[155]

---

[147] Rudolf Pesch, "Zur konzentrischen Struktur von Jona 1," Bib 47 (1966) 577-581.

[148] Stephen Bertman, "Symmetrical Design in the Book of Ruth," JBL 84 (1965) 165-168; Trible, "Two Women in a Man's World: A Reading of the Book of Ruth," Soundings 59 (1976) 251-279.

[149] Nils Wilhelm Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), pp. 94-136.

[150] Trible, "Wisdom Builds a Poem: The Architecture of Proverbs 1:20-33," JBL 94 (1975) 509-518.

[151] Trible, "Depatriarchalizing," pp. 42-43.

[152] Albert Condamin, "Symmetrical Repetitions in Lamentations Chapters I and II," JTS 7 (1906) 137-140.

[153] Arthur Jeffrey, "Daniel," IB (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), Vol.6, p.348, passim; Ad. Lenglet, "La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7," Bib 53 (1972) 169-190.

[154] Barbara Thiering, "The Poetic Forms of the Hodayot," JSS 8 (1963) 189-209; Bonnie Pedrotti Kittel, "The Composition of the Hodayot of Qumran," (Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1975) pp. 34-38, 161-176.

[155] Raymond Pautrel, "Les canons du mashal rabbinique," RSR 26 (1936) 5-45.

It is just as ubiquitous in New Testament writings. It has been identified in Matthew,[156] Mark,[157] and John.[158] It has been found in Luke-Acts.[159] It has been studied in section of the Pauline Corpus[160] and Colossians.[161] The letter of Hebrews and many of its sections are symmetrically constructed.[162] And the Book of Revelation is not immune to the phenomenon.[163]

---

[156] J.C. Fenton, "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew," Studia Evangelica International Congress on New Testament Studies, Vol. 73 (ed. Kurt Aland, et al.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), pp. 174-179; Lohr, "Oral Techniques," pp. 424-434; Paul Gaecheter, Die literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium (SBS 3; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966); Philippe Rolland, "From the Genesis to the End of the World: The Plan of Matthew's Gospel," BTB 2 (1972) 170-176; Charles Homer Giblin, "Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthaean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii. 57-xxviii.20)," NTS 21 (1974-75) 406-420; Angelico Di Marco, "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel. 3. Teil," Linguistica Biblica 39 (1977) 38-57.

[157] See below, pp. 252-253.

[158] M.-E. Boismard, Le prologue de Saint Jean (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1953), pp. 103-108; Xavier Léon-Dufour, "Trois chiasmes Johanniques," NTS 7 (1960-61) 249-255; David Deeks, "The Structure of the Fourth Gospel," NTS 15 (1968-69) 107-128; Vanhoye, "La composition de Jn 5,19-30," in Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.P. Béda Rigaux, (eds. Albert Descamps and André de Halleux; (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), pp. 259-274; Talbert, "Artistry and Theology," pp. 342-360; Di Marco, "Chiasmus: 3. Teil," pp. 69-85.

[159] Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 51-58; Di Marco, "Chiasmus: 3. Teil," pp. 62-68.

[160] Kendrick Grobel, "A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2," in Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag, (ed. Erich Dinkler; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr,1964), pp. 255-261; Wilhelm Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate over Romans," CBQ 38 (1976), 338; K.E. Bailey, "Recovering the Poetic Structure of I Cor. i 17- ii 2. A Study in Text and Commentary," NovT 17 (1975) 265-296; M.L. Barré, "Paul as 'Eschatological Person': A New Look at 2 Cor 11:29," CBQ 37 (1975) 500-526; John Bligh, Galatians in Greek (Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966).

The compositional purpose of the technique has not been systematically studied and there is little consensus. Its origins undoubtedly were in oral composition.[164] It has been considered a mnemonic device for remembering oral tradition.[165] It has been used to argue unity of authorship in both oral literature (Homer)[166] and written (the Pentateuch and Historical Writings).[167] Other scholars have viewed it, on the contrary, as a method for a redactor to put together disparate bits of tradition.[168] Or it has been considered a sophisticated method of original written composition.[169] In fact, the technique has probably been used in all these ways. The primary interest of this study, however, is not in the reason for the use of the technique in Mark but in how such concentric patterns help to illuminate the meaning of the gospel of Mark.

---

[161] Lamarche, "Structure de l'épître aux Colossiens," Bib 56 (1975) 453-463.

[162] Vanhoye, Structure littéraire, passim.

[163] Lund, Chiasmus, pp. 323-330, 342-382, 390-411.

[164] See Lohr, "Oral Techniques," pp. 424-425, and the references cited there.

[165] Talbert, Literary Patterns, p. 81 (in regard to material in Homer; Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript (trans. Eric J. Sharpe; Uppsala: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1961), p. 147 (in regard to Jewish haggadah).

[166] Whitman, Homer, especially in regard to the Iliad.

[167] So Radday. See the articles cited in fn. 139.

Two other issues raised by recognition of symmetrical rhythms do require attention. First, what are sufficient criteria for identifying a concentric pattern? For scholars do not always agree when a particular unit is concentrically constructed, or if they agree that far, they may offer different patterns of parallelism. Two methods of identifying such structures have predominated: the strategic use of word repetition, and content. Content is a broad subject, covering everything from theme, e.g., eschatology, deduced from the content, to manifest content, such as throwing money changers out of the temple, to repetition of narrative details, such as the coming or going of messengers, to changes in audience or setting. In synoptic studies, I would argue that it is appropriate to add a third means: parallelism of form. This does not imply that a concentric pattern need consist of material of only one form-critical type, but rather symmetrical parallelism of form is an added criterion. Parallelism of subsidiary structural elements--as distinct from form-critical classification--can also be an important element in recognition of extended symmetrical patterns.

---

[168] So, for example, those who argue for the overall concentric or chiastic structure of Matthew. See fn. 156.

[169] See the references for Vergil (fn. 138); also Bailey, "1 Cor. i 17-ii 2," among others.

The discussion of adequate criteria will continue to be of concern throughout the following discussion.[170] As a preliminary statement, manifest content should probably be considered the primary criterion. If there is merely a pattern of word repetition, without any correspondence to content, then probably the rhetorical device of key word repetition is being used to provide thematic unity, continuity, etc.--not hook words to define structure.[171] A concentric structure based on content, however, should be confirmed by hook words, form and/or structural similarities, symmetry in details of content, etc. The more different congruent symmetries a text contains, the more certain we may be that a text really has a concentric structure.

The second issue which will be of concern throughout the following rhetorical analysis is the question of the literary or rhetorical function of a (particular) concentric structure. Nils Lund in Chiasmus in the New Testament has endeavored to establish laws of chiastic structure (in most instances what is here defined as concentric structure). The most important are:

---

[170] See especially pp. 231-238, 291-297.

[171] Indeed, some of Thiering's extended chiasms and concentric patterns seem to be instances of key word usage rather than true structural patterns ("Hoyadot," pp. 189-209).

1) "The centre is always the turning point."

2) There is often a change in the trend of the argument in the center, and an opposite idea is introduced, before the original trend is resumed. Lund names this "the law of the shift at the centre."

3) Similar ideas are often distributed so as to be found in the extremes and the center of a concentric system and nowhere else within it.[172]

Lund describes these laws as characteristic of the "form"[173] of symmetrical patterns. And it is surprising how often at least some of his "laws" do occur in concentric structures of Mark. But rather than viewing them as laws, it seems preferable to view them as indicators of what rhetorical functions a concentric structure may serve, that a simple linear structure or repetitive parallelism does not serve as well or in the same way. In this light, Lund's laws might be restated as follows:

1) A concentric structure may serve to emphasize its central element.

2) A concentric structure may serve to hold opposite ideas in tension with one another for the audience. It may be a way of expressing contrast or paradox.

3) A concentric structure may serve to interrelate ideas in a more

---

[172] Lund, Chiasmus, pp. 40-41. The early history of the scholarly study of chiasmus or extended concentric structure may be found in ibid., pp. 25-26, 30-47.

[173] In the sense of form-critical categories.

complex fashion than permitted in a non-symmetrical structure.

A concentric structure may serve any or all or none of the above functions. Frequently, as Lund emphasizes, the emphasis is on the center. Sometimes, however, it does not appear to be. Sometimes, especially in chronological narrative, it appears to fall equally throughout the structure.

Lund virtually ignored linear development within concentric structure. Yet it almost always exists, at least to some degree. And in some instances, such as in the telling of stories, the linear development may be as important as the symmetrical development. For example, the stories of David and Bathsheba and of the rape of Tamar are well-articulated concentric structures.[174] Yet the symmetry hardly suppresses the chronological development; rather it adds depth or another dimension. Thus a fourth way concentric structures may function rhetorically may be posited.

4) A concentric structure may serve to integrate additional dimensions or emphases into a chronological or linear narrative.

Any description of the actual functions of concentric structures in Mark must await the analysis of particular examples. But the general principle may be stated: concentric structure is a way of interrelating material in a variety of ways and with greater complexity than is possible in straight-forward linear narration, whether it be based on logical argument or chronology.

---

[174] Ridout, "Prose Techniques," pp. 50-56, 63-73. Ridout has published an article on the concentric structure and other rhetorical features of the story of the rape of Tamar in Jackson and Kessler, eds., Rhetorical Criticism, pp. 75-84.

Postscript

Three reminders or cautions that perhaps have not been sufficiently stressed in the foregoing discussion should be made:

First, concentric structures are not the only extended literary or rhetorical patterns in Mark. Mark uses units of three in organizing small sections of his gospel[175] and in structuring larger sections such as the entire midsection, Mark 8:27-10:45. The entire gospel has a loose chronological geographical structure, based on the literary formula of a journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. Structures in the gospel are not necessarily entirely discrete, but may overlap or interpenetrate one another. As Sherman E. Johnson has written:

> One may contrast the rhetorical method of Mark with that of Hellenistic and Roman writers by saying that it is oriental: in fact the gospel can be likened to an oriental rug in which many patterns cross one another. They are not made up with mathematical exactitude but developed spontaneously as the author writes. The result is a colourful piece of folk art, sometimes symmetrical, rich, and full of endless fascination, and exhibiting the vitality of early Christianity.[176]

Second, literary-rhetorical criticism is not the only, or even necessarily the primary, methodology by which to reach an understanding of the gospel of Mark. Rhetorical analysis is but one aspect of the larger enterprise of general literary criticism. Source, form and redaction criticism remain the important tools for answering historical questions about the markan material and the gospel's Sitz im Leben. Their limitations are not so much in their method as in the lack of sufficient data from which to draw sound conclusions, and the restricted range of questions they are designed to answer. Newer methodologies such as structuralism also help us to approach the core of the thought of Mark. No one methodology can answer all questions, and all are needed to assist and correct and control each other. Nonetheless, any interpretation of the gospel of Mark should not ignore Mark's means of expression and his rhetorical structures.

---

[175] Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, 15th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959). Lohmeyer overdoes it in forcing all of the gospel into triadic units, but they do occur frequently.

[176] A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), p. 24.

Last, literary-rhetorical analysis is not an exact science. It is as much art as science. How much it reveals about the gospel depends on the skill of the practitioner as well as on texts studied. Such a statement can and should be made about most methodologies appropriate to Biblical criticism.[177] But it is particularly true of literary criticism. For in literary criticism, although there are interpretations which are clearly wrong, not supported by the text, there is not necessarily a single correct interpretation. A good one, however, will illumine the meaning of the text for the reader.

---

[177] See for example, Bultmann (History, p. 47) writing about whether an apophthegm is unitary or non-unitary: "But I admit that I have not prescribed a recipe for dealing with all the controversy and scholastic dialogues: rather does each one require special treatment. Naturally enough, our judgment will not be made in terms of objective criteria, but will depend on taste and discrimination."

CHAPTER II

MARK 2:1-3:6 AND 11-12: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

It was observed in chapter one that rhetorical criticism, although a new methodological approach, builds upon the results of other methodologies. In regard to the structure of sections encompassing several pericopes, rhetorical criticism builds primarily upon the work of source critics and form critics who have investigated larger units of traditions. The relevant scholarly studies consist mainly of hypotheses of premarkan collections.[1]

Scholars who have proposed premarkan collections have not, of of course, been investigating the structure of the markan text, per se. They have been attempting, rather, to account historically for the occurrence or arrangements of blocks of material found in Mark. The work of such scholars, however, often proves helpful for a rhetorical analysis of the material. For the arguments for (or against) a collection are often in fact arguments about the literary nature and interrelationships of the material. Further, the arguments also serve to highlight the issues of theological interpretation raised by a text, that the rhetorical approach in turn must consider, using its own methodology.

---

[1] This study assumes the priority of Mark.

If the literary structure of a section is to be used as a guide to the section's meaning or theology, as is proposed in this study, and if that meaning or theology is to contribute to our overall understanding of Mark, then it is necessary to determine that the literary structure is substantially due to Mark. At a minimum, if it is impossible to disprove the existence of a hypothetical source, that the theology highlighted by the structure is consistent with what is known of Mark's theology. If the theology is consistent, and if the literary techniques uncovered in the rhetorical analysis are found to be fairly common in Mark, then it is unnecessary to assume any premarkan source or collection.

Thus, the following survey and critique of previous research has two purposes. First, it will review those arguments which are relevant to the rhetorical analysis to be made. And second, it will evaluate hypotheses of premarkan collections and patterns to see if they in fact account for the final structure of the markan text, and if they are necessary assumptions for the explanation of the text.

The discussion of Mark 2:1-3:6 will deal only with studies arguing for or against premarkan collections, since the few other studies relevant to its structure will be considered in chapter five, following the rhetorical analysis. The discussion of the public debate material in Mark 11-12 will begin with an overview of the structure of all of chapters 11-13, as an introduction to the problem of determining the limits of rhetorical units in that portion of the gospel. It will include two brief literary analyses of its structure, as well as the proposals for premarkan collections or patterns of arrangement.

Mark 2:1-3:6

In Mark 2:1-3:6, Jesus is shown engaging in five controversies with the scribes and/or the Pharisees concerning his own actions or those of his disciples: Jesus addresses the paralytic, "Your sins are forgiven" (Mk 2:5); Jesus eats with tax collectors and sinners; unlike the Pharisees and the disciples of John, Jesus' disciples do not fast; the disciples, in plucking grain, do unlawful work on the sabbath; Jesus heals on the sabbath. In each conflict, Jesus emerges triumphant, silencing his opponents. They, however, are far from reconciled to him: the fifth and last controversy in the sequence concludes with the statement: "The Pharisees went out, and immediately held counsel with the Herodians against him, how to destroy him" (3:6). The series of conflicts is set off from the surrounding material in which people are portrayed flocking to Jesus, and in which there is no hint of conflict.[2]

The obvious topical unity of the section, in contrast to the more episodic appearance of much of Mark's gospel, is such that scholars, almost without exception, have believed that Mark drew upon an earlier written collection of conflict stories for this portion of his work. First, the seminal theory of Martin Albertz will be considered; then the reactions to Albertz, then alternate proposals, and finally the possibility of no collection at all preceding Mark's organization of the material.

---

[2] The next controversy occurs in 3:22-30.

Martin Albertz

While K.L. Schmidt had earlier suggested that Mark might be dependent upon a controversy source for Mark 2:1-3:6,[3] Martin Albertz in 1921 was the first to argue extensively for Mark's use of an earlier written collection.[4] Albertz views Mark 2:1-3:6 as an early collection of like material, similar to the parable collection in Mark 4.[5] His arguments for the existence of a collection are primarily literary: the section consists of a series of stories showing Jesus in conflict with the Jews over matters of Jewish law, in which the hostility of the opponents gradually increases from silent to direct questioning, climaxing in open hostility in 3:1-6.[6] Mark 3:6, the plotting to destroy Jesus, is the original conclusion to the last story and to the entire collection.[7] The purpose of the collection was to demonstrate the necessity of Jesus' death by showing an overview of the historical conflict between Jesus and his enemies.[8]

---

[3] Rahmen, p. 104.

[4] Streitsgespräche, pp. 5-16.

[5] Ibid., p. 2. [6] Ibid., pp. 5, 7. [7] Ibid., p. 12.

The collection is a concatenation of originally independent stories made without any attempt to reach a climax through the order of questions or of the questioners,[9] and without any formal assimilation of the stories to one another, except for the growing opposition to Jesus.[10] At some point, the sayings in 2:21-22 and 27-28 were added to the individual stories or the collection and the call of Levi, 2:14, was inserted into the collection.[11] Then Mark took over the expanded collection, and by means of the clamps of 2:1 and 13, gave the source a local setting in Capernaum and by the Sea of Galilee.[12]

Albertz′ reasons for rejecting the complex as markan are based on his theological understanding of Mark. The title, Son of man, used in 2:10 and 28, is not employed in Mark′s usual eschatological sense; 2:20, the taking away of the bridegroom, alludes already to Jesus′ death, which Mark himself does not have Jesus unveil until 8:31 in the first passion prediction; and the mention of the plot against Jesus in

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 6, 14, 107.

[9] Johannes Weiss (Das älteste Evangelium [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903], p. 154) ealier also makes the point that there is no increase of hostility in the content of the questions. According to him, the first charge is the severest and the last the lightest.

[10] Streitgespräche, pp. 6, 14. [11] Ibid., pp. 10, 11.

[12] Ibid., p. 14.

3:6 comes too early in Mark's plan.[13] Nonetheless, the place Mark chose to insert the collection was not clumsily selected. It prepares the way for the rejection of Israel in 4:12.[14]

Albertz does not interrelate his literary reasons for a collection with his theological reasons against its markan provenance. So the literary and theological arguments need to be evaluated separately and both must be valid for his hypothesis to stand. The literary arguments--the series of conflicts with increasingly overt hostility between the opponents--remain valid observations on the narrative and imply that the section has some sort of unity or structuring. They do not in themselves indicate whether that unity is due to an earlier collector or the final redactor[15] and Albertz does not so use them. But Albertz has established the first part of his argument: Mark 2:1-3:6 has a certain literary coherence.

---

[13] Albertz also adduces a fourth--and literary or form critical--reason: another controversy story appears shortly afterwards in the gospel (3:22-30) which is different in character and does not build on 2:1-3:6 (Ibid., p. 5). Mark, however, might have chosen to handle the story separately from the others precisely because of its different character or content and for other reaons. Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn (Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium [SUNT 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], p. 21) suggests that its separation is due to Mark's structure. The placing of the story is not really evidence for or against a premarkan collection.

[14] Streitgespräche, p. 5.

[15] Prior to Albertz, Weiss (Evangelium, pp. 154, 161) and Bacon (Beginnings, pp. 22-24) have called attention to the growth of the opposition in 2:1-3:6, and neither believed it to be a premarkan collection.

Albertz' theological objections to markan provenance are not self-evidently valid. They depend on one's theological understanding of the gospel of Mark, and our understanding of Mark has changed drastically since Albertz' day. The very points that Albertz found troublesome, some recent scholars have seen as indicators of Mark's thought. For example, Theodore J. Weeden uses the taking away of the bridegroom in 2:20 virtually as a prooftext for Mark's belief in the absence of Jesus from the community between the resurrection and the parousia.[16] Perrin cites the use of Son of man in 2:10 and 28 as evidence for one of Mark's three characteristic uses of the term, authority on earth,[17] and notes that every major section of the gospel ends on a note pointing ahead to the passion.[18]

Further, Albertz' theological arguments, insofar as they are valid, apply to the individual pericopes rather than to the section as a whole, and therefore do not demonstrate that Mark did not compile the section.[19] Albertz makes no attempt to determine a general theological outlook of his collection which differs from Mark's, or to relate the content of his various objections to each other. As a consequence, even if one accepts Albertz' objections, one could argue that Mark has taken over the alien content from the individual pericopes which he then combined, using the narrative device of the increasing opposition of the opponents.[20]

---

[16] Mark--Traditions in Conflict (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 115, 134.

[17] Introduction, p. 162. So also Weeden, Mark, p. 67.

[18] Introduction, p. 148.

[19] For Albertz, the unitary nature of the section has already been demonstrated by the literary arguments, so there appears to be no need to make a unified case against the section. The occurrence of "Son of man" in a similar but nonmarkan sense in the first and fourth pericopes could be used to argue for some premarkan relationship between at least the first and fourth pericopes.

Thus one must conclude that Albertz has not demonstrated his hypothesis of a premarkan collection in 2:1-3:6. His work, however, remains important. The issues he raised, about the existence and development of a collection, about the literary structure of the section, and about the relation of some of its contents to the theology of Mark, remain issues to this day. And Albertz' literary analyses of the individual materials are frequently valid and illuminating, often unsurpassed in later research. Finally, it should be noted that the fact that Albertz has not proved his case does not in itself dispose of the possibility of a premarkan collection of the five controversy stories.

Critical Reactions to Albertz' Hypothesis

Albertz' theory has been widely praised, frequently adopted, amended as to where it begins and/or ends, sometimes ignored, but rarely challenged until the 1970's. It should be noted that while scholars may disagree over the beginning and ending of the collection, they have generally agreed that Mark 2:1(2), 13, 14, sometimes 21-22, and either 25-26, or 27-28, have been added or inserted into the individual pericopes or the collection, prior to or by Mark.

---

[20] The fact that Albertz finds objections in all but one of the five pericopes (2:13[15]-17) does not enhance the probability of the material as a collection, unless the objections can be shown to relate to each other.

Acceptance of Mark 2:1-3:6 as a premarkan unit

The view that 2:1-3:6 is a premarkan collection has been held by Taylor,[21] Hultgren,[22] and Jan Willem Doeve[23] in dependence upon Albertz.[24] It has also been advanced by Schmid,[25] Willi Marxsen,[26] and Perrin.[27]

---

[21] Formation, pp. 177-179; Mark, pp. 91-92, 191.

[22] "Adversaries," pp. 103-104, 129.

[23] Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Assen: Van Gorcum & Co., 1954), pp. 202-205. Doeve argues that the stories were transmitted in association with the use of Isaiah 57:13b-59:3, since the same subjects are treated in the same order. If true, this would be a powerful argument for a nonmarkan structure for the five stories. However, the parallels to Isaiah seem too forced to support the thesis.

[24] Sundwall (Zusammensetzung, pp. 11-13), Wilfred L. Knox (The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, Vol. 1, p. 8; St. Mark [ed. H. Chadwick; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953]), and Trocme (Formation, p. 34) also have been much influenced by Albertz while disagreeing with him on significant points.

[25] Mark, p. 58.

[26] Introduction to the New Testament (tr. G. Buswell; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 130.

Perrin and Taylor introduce another method into the discussion, with differing conclusions: the presence or absence of typical markan word usage and style. Perrin cites the lack of typical markan connecting links between the pericopes as evidence that they were joined before Mark.[28] Taylor, while noting the absence of any connecting links between pericopes, except for 2:13, finds the vocabulary and style of the section to be typically markan.[29] Taylor reconciles this fact with his acceptance of Albertz′ agruments by suggesting that Mark himself may have compiled the section before he wrote his gospel.[30] As Trocmé writes, "One can admire this harmonious compromise; it is more difficult to support it."[31] The case for a premarkan collection of 2:1-3:6 remains unproved.

The problem of Mark 3:6

Mark 3:6, in its present setting, functions not only as the conclusion to its own pericope, but also as the conclusion to the controversy section as a whole. Albertz′ argument for the literary unity of 2:1-3:6 based on the increasing hostility of the opponents is largely dependent on the climax of 3:6.[32] For this unity to be premarkan, 3:6 itself must be premarkan. Most scholars, however, have argued that the verse is markan redaction.[33] Those positing a premarkan Galilean conflict collection must argue for the premarkan provenance of 3:6.

---

[27] Introduction, p. 145. [28] Ibid. [29] Mark, p. 101.

[30] Ibid., p. 92. [31] Formation, p. 35, fn. 3.

[32] Ingrid Maisch (Die Heilung des Gelähmten [SBS 52; Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1971], p. 117) and Kuhn (Sammlungen, pp. 20-21) argue that the only real increase in conflict is to be found in 3:6. Given the tenor of hostility throughout 3:1-6, this would not seem tenable.

For Albertz, that presented no problem. Mark 3:6, coming too early in Mark's plan, was one of his reasons for arguing that the controversy section could not be markan.[34] It can be argued, however, that it is Mark's intention to show Jesus standing under the shadow of the cross from the beginning of his ministry, and that Mark ends the major sections of his gospel on a note of rejection.[35] While Albertz' argument has some weight--the "plot" against Jesus does not reach the intensity of 3:6 again until 11:18--it is insufficient by itself to prove premarkan composition.

More recently, Ingrid Maisch has attempted to demonstrate that 3:6 is premarkan on the basis of its literary and theological differences from the similar statements in 11:18, 12:12, and 14:1.[36] She notes that the last three all employ the verb ζητέω while 3:6 does not. Further the opponents in 11:18 and 14:1, and by inference in 12:12 as well, are the chief priests and scribes; while the opponents in 3:6 are the Pharisees.[37] The Pharisees, according to Maisch, can hardly be markan "death enemies" since they are mentioned neither in the passion predictions nor the passion narrative.

---

[33] See the discussion and references in Maisch, Gelähmten, pp. 114-116; and Kuhn, Sammlungen, pp. 19-20.

[34] Streitgespräche, p. 5.

[35] Edward J. Mally, "The Gospel of Mark," Jerome Biblical Commentary (ed. Joseph A. Fitzmeyer and Raymond E. Brown; Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1968), Vol. 2, p. 22; Kuhn, Sammlungen, p. 20; Perrin, Introduction, p. 148.

[36] Gelähmten, pp. 114-116.

Maisch's argument does not survive critical scrutiny. Her theological argument that the association of the Pharisees with Jesus' death cannot be markan is difficult to maintain in light of such passages as 8:15 and 12:13. They are not directly associated with bringing about Jesus' death in Mark, because they lacked the legal political authority of the chief priests, elders, and scribes, the membership of the Sanhedrin. Further, the fact that ζητέω is not found in 3:6 would not appear to argue against markan composition of 3:6. The first two death sayings (3:6 and 11:18) both employ the verb, ἀπόλλυμι while the last two are connected by the use in each of κρατέω (12:12, 14:1). Further, Mark might well have avoided ζητέω in 3:6 since the events of 2:1(15)-3:6 do not directly precipitate the passion, while the latter statements follow events which do.

Moreover, 3:6, as it is expressed, is not complete in itself; it raises the question of the further progress and outcome of the plot against Jesus.[38] It does not appear to be a suitable end for a source.[39] W.L. Knox suggests, therefore, that the source may have continued with 12:13-17, followed by a passion account, however brief[40] If Mark, however, has separated the parts of his source so widely in the gospel, he may well also have rearranged and added to or deleted from the source to compile the material now found in 2:1-3:6. Knox's proposal cannot be used to account for the structure of 2:1-3:6.

---

[37] Maisch believes the Herodians are a markan addition (Ibid., pp. 115, 116).

The difficulties in demonstrating that 3:6 has a premakan provenance and in viewing it as the conclusion of an independent source militate against acceptance of Albertz' hypothesis of a Galilean controversy collection.

One or two collections

If Mark 3:6 is considered markan redaction, there is no particular reason to limit the collection of the five stories of 2:1-3:6. A catena of controversy apophthegms could include the debate on Jesus' source of healing power (3:22-30)[41] or the controversies of 11 and 12.[42] The fact that the Pharisees and Herodians are mentioned both in 3:6 and 12:13--and only there--has suggested to some critics that 12:13-37(44) may once have followed the earlier stories in a single collection.[43] The double mention of the Pharisees and Herodians, however, may be explained equally well (or inadequately) on the rhetorical hypothesis that their use in 12:13 serves to recall to the reader's mind the controversies of 2:1-3:6.

---

[38] Dibelius, (Tradition, pp. 219, 223) views 3:6 as markan since it points ahead in the gospel to the passion narrative, preparing the reader for what is to come.

[39] Such an end, of course, would be no more abrupt than Mark 16:8.

[40] Sources, Vol. 1, pp. 10, 12. Knox also suggested that the source might have begun with 1:40-45 (Ibid., p. 8). Anitra B. Kolenkow ("Healing Controversy as a Tie Between Miracle and Passion Material for a Proto-Gospel," JBL 95 [1976] 629) also posits a premarkan connection between 3:6 and the passion, but not between 2:1-3:6 as a whole and the passion.

The existence of a general concatenation of conflict stories is difficult to prove--or disprove. Since Mark has not incorporated such a collection as a whole, and since he might easily have selected and rearranged material from a loose collection, it cannot be used to explain the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 or 11-12.

---

[41] So Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 62-63.

[42] So Bultmann, History, p. 321, fn. 2.

[43] Robert Henry Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 123; Burkill, Revelation, p. 123, fn. 15. Burton Scott Easton ("A Primitive Tradition in Mark," Studies in Early Christianity [ed. Shirley Jackson Case; New York: Century Co., 1928], pp. 87-92) has argued for a collection consisting of 2:13-3:5; 12:13-27, partly on the basis of the double use of the Pharisees and Herodians. His collection is unconvincing since it is sometimes basded on form and sometimes on content. T.W. Manson (Studies in the Gospels and Epistles [ed. Matthew Black; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962],.pp. 43-44) follows Easton, suggesting only that the collection should begin in 2:15.

Alternate Theories of Premarkan Collections

Scholars, although not fully convinced by Albertz' theory or its modifications, have been loathe to abandon the idea of a premarkan conflict collection lying behind 2:1-3:6. Finally, two new proposals appeared in 1971: 1) Maisch's for a collection consisting of 2:15-3:6[44] and Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn's for one consisting of 2:1-28.[45] Their methods as well as their conclusions are different. Maisch seeks to show the literary means and theological intentions of each stage in the development of the healing of the paralytic (2:1-12).[46] The last stage--its pericope in its markan context--leads her into a consideration of the issue of a premarkan collection. Her emphasis on the literary and theological aspects, though drawing on the techniques of form and redaction criticism, is reminiscent of Albertz' fifty years before. Kuhn, on the other hand, doubts the validity of literary critical arguments,[47] and stresses instead the application of form criticism, particularly the determination of Sitz im Leben.[48]

---

[44] Gelähmten, pp. 111-120. Schweizer (Mark, p. 60) earlier posited a collection beginning with 2:15 or 18, but without giving his reasons. Thomas L. Budesheim ("Jesus and the Disciples in Conflict with Judaism," ZNW 62 [1971] 204-205) argues briefly for a collection consisting of 2:15-3:5, since it has "a unified thrust revolving about the concept of conflict," while 2:1-12 only conforms to the conflict theme in its redacted state.

[45] Sammlungen, pp. 53-98. Interestingly, it was also in 1971 that Hultgren reaffirmed Albertz' hypothesis. Unfortunately, he assumes it without critical discussion, and proceeds to a consideration of its Sitz im Leben ("Adversaries," pp. 103-131).

[46] Gelähmten, p. 9. [47] Sammlungen, p. 50.

I. Maisch: Mark 2:15-3:6

Maisch assumes as her starting point the scholarly consensus that a collection exists behind 2:1-3:6 and then proceeds to test for its beginning and ending points.[49] For Maisch, 2:1-12 cannot form part of the original collection because a) it is told in the style of a true miracle story in contrast to the terseness of the four following conflict dialogues; b) the Pharisees are not mentioned in it as they are in the other four; and c) the Pharisees' questions are about correct teaching, not miracles. Mark 3:1-5, the sabbath healing, in her opinion, is not comparable to 2:1-12 since it is not told in the miracle style, and the healing is a necessary part of the conflict, whereas the forgiveness controversy could stand without a healing.[50] If 2:1-12 is excluded, then Mark's editorial introduction in 2:13 and the call of Levi "insertion" (2:14) also fall away. The collection cannot begin earlier than 2:15.[51] As already noted, Maisch argues that Mark 3:6 is the original ending of the collection.

---

[48] Ibid., pp. 13, 45-49. Kuhn correctly faults Albertz for his inadequate attention to Sitz im Leben (Ibid., p. 18) as did Bultmann before him (History, p. 40, fn. 2).

[49] Gelähmten, pp. 111-112.

[50] Ibid., pp. 112-113. [51] Ibid., p. 113.

Thus, a premarkan collector has taken four stories similar in form and theme, already linked by overlapping catchwords, in which the emphasis is on the victorious word of Jesus, and added 3:6 in order to stress the enmity of the Pharisees to Jesus which will lead to his death.[52]

Maisch is certainly correct that 2:1-12 bears more of the marks of a miracle story than 3:1-5(6).[53] Her other reasons for excluding 2:1-12 appear less valid. The absence of the mention of the Pharisees from the first pericope appears to be part of the pattern of shifting groups of opponents presented in 2:1-3:6. The issue of authority to forgive sins in 2:5-10 could also be considered a matter of correct teaching. Further, her pattern of overlapping catchwords includes 2:1-12 as well: sinners/sin connects 2:1-12 with 2:(13)15-17 just as sabbath connects 2:23-28 and 3:1-5.[54] Furthermore, the similarities in form between 2:1-12 and 3:1-6--both healing controversies with the miracle at the end--in contrast to the three middle pericopes, which contain no healing, and are of the standard behavior-question-justification type, would seem to indicate that one cannot exclude 2:1-12 --and not 3:1-5(6)--on the basis of its participation in the miracle form alone.[55] Nor, as has been noted above,[56] can her arguments that 3:6 is premarkan, therefore the end of a collection, be sustained. The evidence does not support her hypothetical collection.

---

[52] Ibid., pp. 115-118.

[53] So also Bultmann, History, pp. 14-16, 212-213; Sundwall, Zusammensetzung, pp. 11-13, among many.

[54] See below, p. 154.

On the other hand, Maisch is quite correct in her literary observation that the conlcusion in 3:6 shifts the emphasis of the material in 2:1(15)-3:5 from Jesus′ triumph over his opponents to the opponents′ implacable hostility to Jesus. Mark 3:6 serves to underline the opposition to Jesus throughout all the controversies.

H.-W. Kuhn: Mark 2:1-28

Kuhn alone attempts to delineate a clear methodology for establishing collections. He argues for the extension of the methodology of form criticism, especially the determination of the function of a tradition in the life of the community, from individual pericopes to possible collections.[57] A premarkan collection may be posited when a series of pericopes of similar form have the same Sitz im Leben in the community, individually and collectively, and when the collection serves the practical needs of the community but does not serve the intention of the evangelist.[58]

---

[55] The sabbath healing controversy in Lk 13:10-17--which has the miracle starting the controversy and so is of the action-objection-justification type--illustrates the extent to which a healing controversy can absorb elements characteristic of the miracle form.

[56] See above, p. 81.

[57] Sammlungen, pp. 12-14.

[58] Ibid., pp. 45-51, 82. Kuhn grants that the individual pericopes need not be of the same form as long as they served the same aim, but he does not find such a situation occurring in Mark.

Kuhn concludes that there was an earlier collection of four units: the healing of the paralytic, the eating with tax collectors and sinners (without vv. 13-14), the question about fasting, and the plucking of grain on the sabbath without its Old Testament reference (vv. 25-26).[59] All four concern Christian practice over against Jewish: the Christian claim to forgive sins, table fellowship with sinners, fasting praxis, and not keeping the sabbath law.[60] And all four conflicts are settled by christological arguments: the Son of man's authority to forgive is grounded not in Jewish argument, but in Jesus' miarcle-working power; association with sinners is permissible because Jesus' (the Christian) mission is to sinners; fasting is related to the presence and absence of the bridegroom; and finally the sabbath law is abrogated by the authority of the Son of man.[61] Verse 28, "the Son of man is lord also of the sabbath," serves as the conclusion not only to its own pericope, but also concludes the entire collection, referring back to the Son of man's authority to forgive in the first story.[62]

---

[59] Ibid., pp. 74, 82-87. [60] Ibid., p. 83.

[61] Ibid. This assumes, of course, that vv. 27-28 are the original conclusion to the plucking grain, not vv. 25-26. Kuhn's argument is somewhat circular here.

[62] Ibid., pp. 73, 76, 87.

Such arguments would only be useful against those who already accept Jesus, who are already Christians. A Jew would consider the answers irrelevant. These four pericopes, as Kuhn reconstructs their premarkan form, individually and collectively serve the needs of the community against Jewish Christians who accept the full power of the earthly Son of man.[63]

The final pericope in Mark's section, 3:1-5, is also on the subject of sabbath observance. The argument justifying breaking the sabbath law, however, is grounded not on Jesus' authority but on a "Jewish-type argument," the general principle of good over evil, life over death.[64]

According to Kuhn, the collection is not markan. Mark is not interested in arguments against Christian Jews. Rather Mark uses the collection to show the objections of the Jewish authorities to Jesus and he places the conflicts in connection with the death of Jesus.[65] The earlier collection accounts for the unusual appearance of the title, Son of man, and also the "too early hints of Jesus about his death" in v. 20.[66]

Kuhn's proposal for a premarkan collection in 2:1-28 contains many helpful observations. His emphasis on the function of the material in the life of the community has led him to make a useful distinction between the content of the conflict--what it is all about, forgiveness, sabbath law, etc.--and the type of argument used to settle the conflict, here appeal to Jesus' authority _or_ "Jewish type." The first four pericopes in Mark 2:1-3:6 presuppose that the opponents accept Jesus' authority; the last does not. This would seem to be a legitimate basis for including one healing controversy but excluding the other. Kuhn has indeed met the first part of his criteria for a collection: several pericopes which individually and collectively have the same _Sitz im Leben_--controversy with Jewish Christians.

---

[63] Ibid., pp. 73, 81-85, 96. [64] Ibid., p. 88.

[65] Ibid., pp. 20, 222-223. [66] Ibid., p. 87.

On the other hand, it is less certain that Kuhn has met the criterion of showing that the collection does not reflect markan interests. It has already been noted that the use of Son of man and the early hints about Jesus' death may well reflect markan concerns.[67] Furthermore, Mark's concern with the Jewish war, his arguments against Jerusalem and the temple, his interest in Galilee as the place of the kingdom of God, both before and after Jesus' death, and his treatment of the disciples, seem to indicate that Mark is indeed engaged in controversy with at least some Jewish Christians.[68] In fairness to Kuhn, however, anti-Jewish-Christian polemic does not appear to be the focus of 2:1-3:6 as a whole.

Moreover, to say that the function of individual pericopes and a group of pericopes is the same, is only partially true. It has already been observed in the discussion of Maisch's proposed collection that the inclusion of 3:6 shifts the emphasis away from the triumph of Jesus onto the opposition to him. The literary emphasis also shifts as a result of aggregating the stories. In the individual story, the stress is on the particular content--e.g., Jesus authorized violation of the sabbath, therefore we do not have to keep the sabbath. By combining the four stories, the emphasis shifts in a large measure to the common factor: the authority of Jesus. The collection, although certainly useful in debate with Jewish Christians, becomes in itself a proclamation of the "full authority of the Son of man," as Kuhn himself implicitly realized.[69] Kuhn could have strengthened his argument by providing a Sitz im Leben for the collection as a whole--a community or redactor interested in exalting or defending the earthly authority of the Son of man.

---

[67] See above, p. 76.

[68] Kelber, _Kingdom_, pp. 130-131; Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," p. 188; Marxsen, _Introduction_, p. 143.

Kuhn's hypothesis, however, cannot be dismissed outright.[70] His proposed collection does stress the earthly authority of the Son of man, an emphasis which does not occur elsewhere in Mark. Further, the use of Son of man in 2:10 and 28 would serve as an inclusio for such a collection, giving it a rudimentary literary structure of its own.[71] The presence of a literary structure which is not the structure of the final text is, for a rhetorical critic, a strong argument for the existence of an earlier collection. The possibility of Kuhn's collection would seem tenable.

---

[69] Sammlungen, p. 223. Kelber, in his discussion of 2:1-3:6 (Kingdom, pp. 18-22) argues that Mark and his community share the belief in the Son of man, and Mark uses this common basis to argue for his own purposes. The following rhetorical analysis would appear to support Kelber's position (see below, pp. 218-222). Mark, however, could have been using either a "Son of man collection" or compiling isolated traditions.

[70] It is too soon to evaluate the critical response to Kuhn's theory. Kelber (Kingdom, p. 18) accepts Kuhn's collection. However, Kelber's analysis of 2:1-3:6 makes no use of Kuhn's theory and in places appears to contradict it (Ibid, pp. 18-22). Theodore J. Weeden is critical of Kuhn's hypothesis on the grounds that it does not take account of the connection between 2:1-28 and Mk 1, and the emphasis

Summary

Maisch's and Kuhn's studies have several implications for understanding the rhetorical structure of Mark 2:1-3:6. First, they demonstrate that a shift in literary emphasis occurs when material is combined and thereby placed in a larger context. Kuhn, unwittingly perhaps, has shown that individual arguments useful for a preacher/-teacher in a polemic addressed to Jewish Christians who seem to him too closely bound to the old way, become a powerful plea for the earthly authority of the Son of man when they are combined.

---

upon the disciples found in that material ("The Conflict between Mark and his Opponents over Kingdom Theology," 1973 Seminar Papers,[ed. George MacRae; SBLASP 109; Society of Biblical Literature, 1973], Vol. 2, p. 230).

[71] If Kolenkow ("Healing Controversy," pp. 635-636) is correct in her argument that Mark has changed the form of 2:1-12 from the standard controversy form of behavior (miracle): objection: justification to a form with the healing at the end, Kuhn's hypothesis would be strengthened. It would make the healing of the paralytic comparable in form to the other three pericopes in his proposed collection; and it would place the climax of 2:1-12 not on the concluding healing but on the authority of the Son of man which Kuhn sees as the thread of the collection.

And Maisch has shown the shift in literary emphasis from the triumph of Jesus to the continued opposition of the opponents, accomplished by the inclusion of 3:6. Second, Kuhn's recognition of the christological emphasis present in 2:1-28 but absent from 3:1-6, raises the question of whether Mark's (or a prior redactor of 2:1-3:6) major interest in presenting the material is christological or whether the christology is something the redactor accepted, even took for granted, and used to show the basis of opposition to Jesus, or for other reasons.[72]

The Possibility of No Premarkan Collection

Although not all scholars explicitly accept the hypothesis of a premarkan collection (of whatever extent) behind Mark 2:1-3:6, very few scholars have gone so far as to imply that Mark compiled the five pericopes himself. J. Weiss in 1903 did suggest that Mark was the compiler.[73] Taylor, as noted, suggested that Mark compiled 2:1-3:6 prior to his composition of the gospel.[74] E. Trocmé suggests another variant: that Mark composed 2:1-3:6 on the model of Albertz' Jerusalem controversy collection, which Mark used in chapters 11-12.[75]

---

[72] The latter interest could be true if the redactor was using a prior collection or combining individual traditions known to him. However, if it can be shown that Mark used a collection such as that suggested by Kuhn, then the argument that Mark's primary purpose in presenting the section 2:1-3:6 is not christological would be greatly strengthened.

[73] Evangelium, p. 161.

[74] See above, p. 79. In Formation, first published in 1933, Taylor assumes that 2:1-3:6 is premarkan. In his commentary on Mark, first published in 1952, Taylor still accepts Albertz' arguments in regard to a collection, but because of the markan vocabulary and style, suggests that Mark might have composed it prior to writing the gospel.

Recently, scholars have begun to argue against a premarkan Galilean Galilean controversy collection. G. Minette de Tillesse, for example, holds that Mark grouped and arranged the stories in 2:1-3:6 on the grounds that the stories reflect Mark's overall theology--his veiled christology or "messianic secret."[76] However, the christology Minette de Tillesse finds so prominent in 2:1-3:6 is found in, and only in, the material Kuhn includes in his proposed premarkan collection.[77]

Anitra B. Kolenkow, as a byproduct of her argument for a "healing-controversy gospel" source used independently by Mark and John, has argued against a controversy collection of 2:1-3:6 on form-critical and redactional grounds as well as on theological grounds.[78] Her major thesis is that, in the proposed source, miracles and passion --that is, gospel--are tied together through healing controversy culminating in death threats against Jesus.

Kolenkow observes that the single healing controversy story in

---

[75] Trocmé, Formation, pp. 34-36; Jesus, pp. 52-54.

[76] Secret, pp. 160-162.

[77] In fairness to Minette de Tillesse, Kuhn's work appeared some five years after his. He could not be expected to counter it.

[78] "Healing Controversy," pp. 623-638. See also "Beyond Miracles," p. 158.

John 5:1-18 deals with the same material that Mark covers in the two healing conflicts, Mark 2:1-12 and 3:1-6. There are verbal and content parallels (the "pallet" command to the sick man, sabbath healing, claiming divine power) and both conclude with the Jews attempting to destroy Jesus.[79] The connection to the passion is strengthened by the fact that in Mark the words κατηγορέω and συμβούλιον occur only in Mark 3:1-6 and 15:1-4.[80]

In the proposed source, the tie between controversy and death is found in the healing controversies only. According to Kolenkow, Mark has transformed the healing controversies in form and content from the proto-gospel to depict a Jesus who is not legally guilty, a markan interest.[81] Mark has then used the healing controversies of

---

[79] "Healing Controversy," p. 628.

[80] Ibid., p. 629. The occurrence of the words only in 3:1-6 and 15:1-4 may indicate, as Kolenkow argues, Mark's resumption of the use of a source. They may also be a markan rhetorical device to recall 3:1-6 to the reader's mind at the time of Jesus' being handed over to Pilate. The two views are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

[81] Ibid., pp. 636-637. On the change in form, see above, p. 92, fn. 71. It would not appear, however, that Mark has changed the form of 2:1-12 in order to portray a "legal" Jesus, since the accusation of blasphemy which Jesus does not evade (2:5-10a) is the legal charge upon which the Sanhedrin condemns him (14:64). However, the change in form may well be markan for rhetorical reasons (see below, pp. 320-321.) Furthermore, the present form of 3:1-6 may not be due to the redactor's desire to present Jesus as one who obeys the law when appraised of it, but rather to the redactor's desire for parallelism between 3:1-6 and 2:1-12 (see below, pp. 197-201). 3:1-6 does, however, present a legal Jesus. Unlike 2:5a,10a, there is no indication in 3:1-6 that Jesus begins to act illegally--the comman, "Stand up in the middle," like "Stretch out your hand," was legal on the sabbath (3:3,5). Though the change in form of 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 does not appear to be the result of

2:1-12 and 3:1-6 as "passages enclosing and reinforcing the non-healing controversies of 2:15-28."[82] This may well be an example of the markan technique of beginning and ending sections with miracles, as seen in the miracles surrounding 9:30-10:45.[83] The middle stories in 2:1-3:6 are eating controversies, and would help clear the way for inclusion of Gentiles, a markan interest.[84] Thus, Kolenkow would argue that Mark has composed 2:1-3:6 for his own purposes. Whether or not one accepts Kolenkow's proto-gospel source theory,[85] the fact that she can propose an explanation of the markan development of traditional material in 2:1-3:6 which excludes the hypothesis of a Galilean controversy collection suggests that no such hypothesis may be necessary.

Kuhn's and Kolenkow's conflicting hypotheses both seem tenable. However, the feasibility of explaining the theology and the markan

---

a desire to show Jesus obeying the law, the present form would still support a markan shift away from a proto-gospel showing controversy over healing as the cause of Jesus' death. The rhetorical structure of 2:1-12 indicates a separation of the charge of blasphemy from Jesus' healing activity, and 3:1-6, unlike John 5:1-18, does not portray illegal healing activity on the sabbath.

[82] Ibid., p. 628. [83] Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," p. 158.

[84] Kolenkow, "Healing Controversy," p. 628, fn. 20.

[85] The viability of Kolenkow's hypothesis would appear to depend not on her argument in regard to Mk 2:1-3:6, but on the demonstration of the independence of John and Mark. Given the continued existence of oral tradition well into the second century, it would seem possible to explain Mark's and John's different use of the healing controversy/-death tradition and John's verbal and structural similarities with Mark on the basis of John's use of Mark and oral tradition.

redactional development of the structure of 2:1-3:6 without positing a premarkan collection, suggests that the assumption of a premarkan collection may be an unnecessary one. A redaction critic should perhaps begin by attempting to explain the material in Mark 2:1-3:6 on the basis of markan compilation, not on the basis of Mark's use of a prior controversy collection.

Precisely this point has been put forward by D.-A. Koch in 1975.[86] He argues that all the reasons put forward for a collection can easily be explained without any such assumption:

(1) Neither 3:6 [Albertz and Maisch] not 2:28 [Kuhn] need to be explained as premarkan redactional conclusions to a collection. 3:6 is not only a conclusion but points ahead to the passion, a redactional technique of Mark. 2:28 shows no recognizable difference from other passages considered to be markan redaction.

(2) The use of Son of man in 2:10 and 28 is indeed unusual. However, neither use is in contradiction with the construction of the gospel, and both are in conformity with the major theme begun in Mark 1:21--that of the authority of the Earthly one.

(3) The fact of the form-critical and content similarities of the traditions in 2:1-3:6 is not a proof for a premarkan collection. To place together related traditions would occur to an evangelist as well as to any other compiler of tradition.

---

[86] Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975), pp. 33-34.

(4) The loose construction of Mark 2:1-3:6 can be understood without difficulty as markan compilation. It does not point to a markan insertion into a larger narrative.[87]

Koch's first three points are well-taken, although they do not definitively exclude Kuhn's hypothesis. The fourth cannot be so readily accepted. The following rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-3:6 will show that the section is in fact a closely interwoven and tightly constructed literary unit. Further, it is set in a frame (1:45; 3:7-8) which contrasts sharply with the material in 2:1-3:6. Mark 2:1-3:6 can certainly qualify for consideration as a markan insertion or interpolation into a larger entity. Thus the rhetorical critic wishing to use the results of the rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-3:6 for understanding the literary techniques and theology of the gospel of Mark as a whole, must be able to argue that 2:1-3:6 is not a markan insertion into a preexisting narrative but Mark's own handling of tradition. This question will be returned to in chapter six, following the detailed rhetorical analysis of 2:1-3:6 and a brief consideration of some rhetorical structures similar to 2:1-3:6 found elsewhere in Mark. Before turning to the rhetorical analysis, however, it is necessary to give some preliminary consideration to structural issues in Mark 11-12.

---

[87] Ibid.

Mark 11-12
Jerusalem Public Debate

In chapters 11 and 12, Mark once again portrays Jesus participating in a series of public controversies: Jesus debates the source of his authority (11:27-33); he argues whether or not taxes should be paid to Caesar (12:13-17); whether or not there is individual resurrection (12:18-27); he publicly discusses what is the fundamental demand of God (12:28-34); and he inquires how the scribes can say that the Christ is the son of David (12:35-37).

The Jerusalem public debate material presents a different problem for the literary critic investigating rhetorical structure than did the Galilean public debate in Mark 2:1-3:6. The Galilean section, as we saw, constituted a coherent literary subunit within Mark's gospel as determined by form, content, and contrast with surrounding materials. The only major preliminary issue, still unresolved, is whether the unity is markan or premarkan.

The Jerusalem debates, on the other hand, are not a literary unit on the basis of form, content or contrast with surrounding material. They are not even all contiguous. Further, the climax of conflict between Jesus and his opponents in chapters 11-12 is not primarily associated with the public debates.[88] As in 3:6, twice in 11-12, the reader is informed of Jesus' opponents' desire to destroy or arrest him.[89] The first instance follows Jesus' cleansing of the temple (11:18), and the second follows his teaching of the allegorical parable of the wicked tenants (12:12). Most of the debate material follows 12:12.

---

[88] Albertz, Streitgespräche, p. 16.

Indeed, why the public debates are placed during the Jerusalem public ministry is not obvious.[90] Between the opening confrontation between Jesus and the Jewish leaders in the temple cleansing and the parable of the wicked tenants at the beginning, and the great eschatological discourse to the inner circle of disciples in chapter thirteen, fall the public debates with the attached warning against the scribes and the story of the widow's mite. This material appears to destroy the topical and dramatic narrative development of Mark 11-13. It seems rather miscellaneous in content and definitely tame in comparison to the rest of Jesus' Jerusalem ministry.

Yet, the public debates are the second major block of such material in Mark, and they occupy a substantial portion of the Jerusalem ministry. As in the case of 2:1-3:6, scholars have resorted to hypotheses of a premarkan collection or literary pattern to explain the Jerusalem debate material. Before turning to a brief review and critique of their theories, an overview of the narrative of Mark 11-12 from a literary perspective will be made to provide a basis for further discussion.

---

[89] In fact, these are the first such statements since 3:6.

[90] It is possible, of course, that some of the debate material was associated with Jerusalem in the tradition. Albertz believes the independent stories became associated through their common location in the temple (Streitgespräche, pp. 16, 35). Given the general freedom of the gospels in regard to the settings of traditions, traditional association would not sufficient to explain their setting in Mark.

Overview of the Narrative of Mark 11-12 From a Literary Perspective

As has long been recognized, the Jerusalem ministry in Mark is divided into three days: the day of the entry into Jerusalem (10:46-11:11), the day of the cleansing of the temple (11:12-19), and the third day, which includes public debates, public teaching, private teaching, and Jesus' long private discourse on the future (11:20-13:37). Following the three day chronology, the overview will focus primarily on narrative interconnection and structure.

Day one

Day one contains two incidents, the healing of the blind Bartimaeus on the way to Jerusalem (10:46-52) and the triumphal scene at the entrance to Jerusalem (11:1-11).[91] These two scenes provide a transition from the predominately private teaching of the way section (8:27-10:45) to the public Jerusalem ministry, and serve as a prologue to the Jerusalem ministry itself.[92] In both pericopes, the reader is reminded of Jesus′ popularity with the crowd, and is prepared for the role of the crowd in the Jerusalem ministry proper.[93]

---

[91] The beginning of day one is not in fact indicated in the markan text. The healing of Bartimaeus along with the healing of a blind man in Mk 8:22-25, form a frame for the way section. However, as Vernon K. Robbins ("The Healing of Blind Bartimaeus (10:46-52) in Marcan Theology," JBL 92 [1973] 224-243) has demonstrated, the pericope also serves as a transition to the Jerusalem ministry. Since the pericope serves the double function of framing the way section and providing a transition to the Jerusalem ministry, it seems rhetorically appropriate to include it as part of day one.

Secondly, the motif of Davidic messianism occurs in both pericopes. Bartimaeus, while still blind, twice addresses Jesus as "Son of David" (10:47-48). The crowd cries out as Jesus rides on the colt towards Jerusalem: "Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David" (11:10). These are the first mentions of Davidic messianism in the gospel of Mark, and they occur precisely at the point when Jesus is about to enter the city of David.

Day two

Day two contains the first major event of Jesus′ public ministry in Jerusalem, Jesus′ acting out the proleptic fall of the temple.[94] Jesus casts out those buying and selling; he overturns the tables and

---

[92] The nature of the triumphal scene as prologue is indicated by the fact that Mark apparently pictures it occuring outside of Jerusalem, which is only entered in 11:11. So Schmidt, *Rahmen*, pp. 397-398; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 233; Kelber, *Kingdom*, p. 93.

[93] See ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ, πολλοὶ in 10:46-52 and πολλοὶ, ἄλλοι, οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες in 11:8,9. The crowd of course has not been entirely absent in 8:27-10:45, but the theme of Jesus′ popularity is not emphasized there as it was in Mk 1-8 and as it will be in 11-12.

[94] On the meaning of the temple cleansing and its relation to eschatology, see R.H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 60-69; Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, pp. 231-236; Donahue, *The Christ*, pp. 113-115; Kelber, *Kingdom*, pp. 99-102, 109-113, 130-144; Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," pp. 172-183; Weeden, "Conflict," pp. 225-226.

UMI

seats of the money changers and dove sellers (11:15). Alluding to Jeremiah's speech that God will once again permit the temple to fall, Jesus accuses the cult leaders of making the temple "a den of thieves" (Jer 7:11, Mk 11:17). In the temple cleansing, Jesus takes the initiative strongly against the Jewish establishment, and they indeed take offense. The reader is told that the chief priest and the scribes wish to destroy Jesus but fear the crowd (11:18). In the gospel of Mark, Jesus' dramatic act in the temple is the precipitating cause of his death.

The temple cleansing is framed[95] by the story of the cursing and withering of the fig tree, "for it was not the season for figs" (11:12-14, 20-25).[96] It is no longer the time of Israel. The incident of the fig tree and its associated teaching is private, witnessed by the disciples only. It is not part of the public Jerusalem ministry. By the device of the shift in audience, and the interposition-frame technique, the fig tree material is rhetorically set apart from the main development of the narrative of Jesus' public ministry.[97]

---

[95] Or, in other words, the temple cleansing is an interposition in the fig tree narrative.

[96] Gerhard Münderlein, "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes," NTS 10 (1963-64) 88-104.

[97] It will be argued below (pp. 128-130, 191-192) that the technique of interposition is used in 2:6-10a and in 2:1-3:6 as a whole to present material to the reader while setting it (or its logical consequences) to one side in terms of narrative development. Here the technique is used in reverse: it is the material framing the interposition which is set apart from the main narrative development.

Day three

The second half of the fig tree episode begins day three.[98] This fact, plus the overloading of material on day three, indicate that the rhetorical structure of the Jerusalem ministry does not coincide with the chronological division into days. Day three continues with seven pericopes, either debates or teaching, all set in the temple and witnessed by the crowd.

The controversy apophthegm on authority (11:27-33). When Jesus enters the temple the next day, the chief priests, scribes and elders, the representatives of the full Sanhedrin, question Jesus on his authority to do "these things" (11:28). The logical narrative antecedent of "these things" is Jesus' acts and words in the temple cleansing.[99] Jesus, by bringing up the question of John the Baptist's authority, avoids answering the question.

The parable of the wicked tenants (12:1-12). Jesus, however, immediately proceeds to tell the allegorical parable of the wicked tenants, in which the owner of the vineyard "will come and destroy the tenants, and give the vineyard to others" (12:9). They--the priests, scribes and elders of 11:27--recognize that the parable is told against them and wish to arrest him. But again they fear the crowd and leave Jesus (12:12).

---

[98] On the relationship of the fig tree incident and the three day chronology, see Charles W.F. Smith, "No Time for Figs," JBL 79 (1960) 315-327.

[99] Donahue, The Christ, p. 119., fn. 2.

The first three pericopes recounting Jesus' public ministry in Jerusalem--the temple cleansing, the question on authority, and Jesus' parable against the tenants--constitute a dramatic and thematic unity.[100] In all three, the characters are Jesus, the crowd, and the legitimate Jewish authority, members of the Sanhedrin. In all three, the authorities fear the crowd (11:18, 32; 12:12). In structure, the pericopes may be considered an extended controversy apophthegm of the action-objection-vindication type. Jesus' objectionable behavior is the cleansing of the temple; the opponents question his authority for so doing; Jesus avoids a direct answer, but through the parable condemning the tenants, implicitly claims to have God's authority.

The issue of the controversy is a fundamental one: essentially whether Jesus or the legitimate temple authorities speak for God. This is brought out even in Jesus' counter-question on authority: τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ ᾿Ιωάννου ἐξ οὐπρανοῦ ἦν ἦ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; The level of conflict is high: Jesus prophesies God's destruction of the authorities, and they, on the other hand, seek to destroy Jesus. The confrontation, however, is not yet to be resolved. The authorities fear to act because of Jesus' popularity with the crowd. For the moment, Jesus is left unharmed in the temple and the atmosphere of confrontation fades away.

---

[100] This grouping of material is not the most common one in Biblical criticism, which usually sees a new beginning in the first controversy on day three, the question on authority. A full rhetorical analysis of 11:15-18 and 27-33, 12:1-12 is outside the scope of this study. My reasons for this structure are briefly given above, the setting aside of the fig tree episode by means of the frame and shift in audience, and the dramatic and thematic unity of the pericopes. Several scholars do view 12:13 as a new beginning: Farrer, Mark, p. 118; Burkill, Revelation, p. 123, fn. 15; John Bowman, The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), pp. 221, 224, 266; Donahue, The Christ, p. 116; Perrin, Introduction, p. 158.

Three questions (12:13-17, 18-27, 28-34). First, the opponents of the preceding pericopes, the legitimate Jewish political authority, send the Pharisees and Herodians to try to catch Jesus in his talk. The introduction of the Pharisees and Herodians recalls to the reader's mind the earlier controversies in 2:1-3:6, and the Pharisees' and Herodians' determination at that time to destroy Jesus. In their question about the legitimacy of paying taxes to Casesar, an attempt to discredit Jesus with the crowd, Jesus adroitly avoids the horns of the political dilemma. The Sadducees, another Jewish religious group, then question Jesus about the resurrection, and Jesus informs them their understanding is wrong. Finally a single scribe questions Jesus about the fundamental commandement, and Jesus and the scribe agree on the basic demands of God. At this point, Jesus is triumphant and no one dares question him further (12:34).

Public teaching (12:35-37, 38:40). Immediately after the school debate in which Jesus and a scribe are portrayed in agreement with each other, two examples of Jesus' teaching criticizing the scribes are appended. First, Jesus questions the scribes' understanding of the Christ as the Son of David; then he warns against them, criticizing their behavior and prophesying their condemnation.

Private teaching (12:41-44, 13:1-2, 3-37). In 12:41-44, Jesus points out to his disciples the good example of the poor widow contributing to the temple treasury. Next, Jesus and his disciples leave the temple, and Jesus prophesies the destruction of the temple. Jesus' earlier act of cleansing the temple is recalled to the reader's mind. Finally the third day ends with Jesus' extended discourse on the future with the inner circle of disciples, the apocalyptic discourse.

Summary

The first day forms a prologue to the Jerusalem ministry. The second day, and the first incidents of the third day, spell out the conflict between Jesus and the legitimate Jewish power over who truly represents God. The conflict is not resolved because of the presence of the crowd.. Then the obvious coherence of the narrative and its dramatic effect are dissipated in a series of questions and public teachings of Jesus. In one scholar's words, "The stories do not form any easily recognizable pattern nor do they rise to a climax."[101] Then, after an apparently unrelated episode of private teaching, the narrative reverts to the theme of the destruction of the temple and future events. The problem for the rhetorical critic is to explain or account for the two controversies over taxes and the resurrection, the school debate on the first commandment, and the assorted public and private teaching in the temple.

---

[101] Ernest Best, The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology (SNTSMS 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 85.

Proposed Explanations of the Jerusalem Public Debate Material

Solutions external to the text

Martin Albertz. As well as positing a Galilean controversy collection, Albertz also posited a Jerusalem one, collected by a different circle.[102] It too consists of five controversies, the debate on authority, the questions on tribute, resurrection, the great commandment, and David's son (11:27-33; 12:13-27). Albertz based his argument for a collection on the inner uniformity of the material which concerns the five most important issues of the Judaism of the day, and in which Jesus as teacher triumphs over all opponents in turn.[103] For the collector, the question was: Jesus or the Rabbis?[104] The collection, he argued, could not be markan because it contains no hint of the coming suffering and death of Jesus, and so stands in sharp contrast to the other material found in Mark 11-12.[105]

---

[102] Streitsgespräche, pp. 16-36, 107-108.

[103] Ibid., pp. 18, 26-27, 35-36. [104] Ibid., p. 27.

[105] Ibid., pp. 18-19, 113.

Albertz′ hypothesis, although accepted by some,[106] has not received the wide acceptance that his proposed Galilean controversy collection did. Neither Knox, who delighted in sources,[107] nor Kuhn,[108] saw sufficient grounds to posit any premarkan collection in Mark 11-12. The inner uniformity of the collection is to be doubted. The diversity of forms has already been noted. Only the first, the question on authority, is a controversy apophthegm arising out of Jesus′ behavior. The second and third (taxes and resurrection) belong to Bultmann′s category of "questions asked by opponents."[109] They might better be described as hostile school debates. The fourth is a friendly school debate, and the last is not a debate at all.

In terms of content, the first story of the proposed collection, the demand for the source of Jesus′ authority, and the last, the question of David′s son, do not concern the most important issues of first century Judaism. And, strictly speaking, the sequence of opponents ends with the third story. The fourth debate is initiated by a single scribe--who, as an opponent, is already included among the opponents of the first story; the last story has no opponents.[110] Thus, while Albertz is certainly correct that at least some of the debates are in sharp contrast to the other contents of Mark 11-12, the debate material does not have sufficient unity or coherence to be considered a collection.

---

[106] Sundwall (Zusammensetzung, pp. 72, 75) follows Albertz but notes that the collection is less unified than 2:1-3:6, so a premarkan source is not as certain here. Taylor, as in the case of 2:1-3:6, first accepted Albertz′ hypothesis (Formation, p. 179) and later suggests that because of the collection′s similarity of vocabulary and style to the rest of Mark, Mark himself may have compiled it prior to writing his gospel, for catechetical purposes (Mark, p. 101). Schmid (Mark, p. 213) believes Mark found the stories as a unit in the tradition. Trocmé accepts Albertz′ collection, but thinks Mark my have added the Son of David question (Formation, pp. 34-36, 97; Jesus, pp. 52-54).

[107] Sources, Vol. 1, pp. 85-88.

[108] Sammlungen, pp. 39-43. See also Donahue, The Christ, p. 115.

[109] See above, pp. 46-49.

David Daube. Daube argues that the four pericopes, 12:13-37, are modelled on the Alexandrian pattern of four questions, particularly the questions of the four sons at the Passover Haggadah.[111] (He does not argue whether it was Mark or an earlier compiler who structured the material in this way.) Daube's theory cannot be sustained. It is questionable whether the Passover Haggadah pattern was so fixed a pattern at the time.[112] The more serious problem is that the questions in Mark do not really fit the types of the Haggadah questions.

---

[110] Albertz notes that after the scribe of the fourth story, there were no more opponents left to question Jesus, so Jesus initiated the last (Streitsgespräche, p. 16). However, the single scribe is not really an opponent, and the collector could have continued with a series of individual scribes or Pharisees.

[111] New Testament, pp. 158-169; "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," NTS (1958-59) 180-184.

[112] Fred G. Francis, "The Baraita of the Four Sons," Book of Seminar Papers (ed. Lane C. McGaughy, SBLASP 108; Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), Vol. 1, pp. 245-266.

Above all, the issue of the Christ as David's son is not a comparison of two scriptures both of which are true in some sense, but rather a contrast between the views of scripture and of the scribes similar to that found in Mark 7.

Summary. The rhetorical critic analysing the public debate material in Mk 11-12 (if she wishes to generalize from her results to the gospel of Mark as a whole) need not concern herself with the possibility that the rhetorical structure is due to a premarkan collection or pattern.

Internal solutions

The lack of viability of the suggestions for a premarkan controversy collection and a nonmarkan structural pattern in Mark 11-12, combined with the trend in America for redaction criticism to move towards general literary criticism, has led two scholars to look briefly at the markan text to see if any structure is to be discerned in it.

John Donahue. Donahue, in his brief investigation of the literary structure of 11-12, views 11:1-26 as the introduction, built up by a careful sequence of temporal and geographical units; 11:27-12:12 as the "midpiece" of the section, culminating in the second reference to the Sanhedrin's desire to arrest Jesus; and 12:13-44 as a "loose Marcan construction by means of sequential appearances of adversaries and catchwords."[113] The great commandment, the question of David's son, and the denunciation of the scribes are connected by the catchword, "scribe," while the story of the widow's mite is joined to the denunciation of the scribes because of the catchword, "widow."

Donahue has noted the connection between the question on authority and the parable of the wicked tenants, and the new beginning in 12:13. He has noted the hook word sequence, but not that such construction in Mark is often an indicator of more complex structural relationships.

Norman Perrin. Perrin, in his brief exegetical remarks on Mark 12 in his New Testament Introduction, has noted some rhetorical units within 12:13-44.[114] Mark 12:13-34 is a unit of three controversies in which the first two questioners are hostile and the last sympathetic. Perrin suggests that the contrast is deliberate. 12:35-40 reports two stories critical of the scribes. Finally, the chapter closes with the story of the widow's mite, which points ahead in the gospel to the sacrifice of Jesus.

Perrin, like Donahué, notes that a new beginning is made in 12:13. He goes beyond Donahue's "loose Marcan construction" to note structural groupings of the material in 12:13-44. Perrin's analysis suggests a rudimentary pattern or coherence to Mark 12. It remains for the rhetorical critic to analyze the material from a rhetorical perspective to find out if the structure is more than rudimentary, and to see how the rhetorical structure (or lack of it) helps to illumine the function of the debates in the Jerusalem public ministry. The subject will be taken up again in chapter five.

---

[113] The Christ, pp. 115-117.

[114] Introduction, p. 158.

CHAPTER III

FIRST READING OF MARK 2:1-3:6

It is now time to turn to the detailed rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-3:6, to see how the methodology outlined in chapter one--that of first studying the text for its use of rhetorical techniques and its indications of literary structure, and then seeing how this analysis helps us to understand the meaning of the text--helps to illumine the meaning of 2:1-3:6 for the reader. For it is the task of the rhetorical critic to educate and sensitize the reader/hearer to the experience of reading--or listening to--the text of the gospel of Mark.

The following rhetorical analysis of 2:1-3:6 consists of two parts: first, an analysis of the literary techniques and rhetorical structure in each of the five individual pericopes, and second a study of the structure of 2:1-3:6 as a whole. The two parts may be better described as two successive readings of the text. The first reading is a linear or progressive reading, stressing the major rhetorical features and smaller structural units as they occur in the narrative. The second reading is an architectonic or rhythmic reading of the text as a whole. The second reading will build upon the first, and call attention to new--and in this instance, elaborate--interrelationships of the material. It will discuss what light the rhetorical analysis sheds on the meaning of the section as a whole. The first reading will be presented in this chapter; the second in the following one.

In the course of the rhetorical analysis, various exegetical, and upon occasion, redactional conclusions will be drawn. However, no systematic attempt will be made to address redactional questions. The rhetorical approach is not a branch of the redactional enterprise. The rhetorical critic is not asking the historical question of how and why Mark has redacted the tradition to form the present text. The rhetorical critic is asking the literary question of how the rhetorical features of the present text--structure, pattern, rhythm--affect the reader's response to and understanding of that text.

Since the rhetorical approach builds upon form criticism, the first reading, the analysis of the individual pericopes, will begin with a consideration of the form of the pericope. It will then continue with a discussion of the rhetorical structure and other rhetorical features to be found in the individual elements of the pericope and in the pericope as a whole. The rhetorical interconnections of a pericope with the one that preceded it will be noted. Exegetical conclusions will be pointed out, as the analysis warrants.

Mark 2:1-12: The Healing of the Paralytic

The story of the healing of the paralytic with its controversy over Jesus' authority to forgive sins is, in form, a healing controversy of the second type, with the healing at the end. The exposition or narrative introduction is unusually long and detailed: vv. 1-2 serve as a general introduction, setting the scene; vv. 3-4 set up the healing situation; and v. 5 starts the actual healing. Then, for vv. 6-10a, the healing is suspended, while some scribes and Jesus enter into conflict.[1] Verses 10b-12a resume and complete the healing, and v. 12b concludes the narrative, presenting the crowd reaction. Thus, vv. 6-10a are an interposition in the miracle, narrative, giving the pericope a circular rhythm.[2]

The narrative may be outlined as follows:

a Introduction (vv. 1-2)
Healing (vv. 3-5)

b Controversy (vv. 6-10a)

a′ Healing (vv. 10b-12a)
Conclusion (v. 12b)

As the text now stands, Mark 2:1-12 is a complex, carefully constructed story, characterized by abrupt shifts in the plot line _and_ careful rhetorical intertwining of the elements of the study. The individual elements will first be discussed separately.

---

[1] Scholars (the majority) who believe that at some point the controversy was added to the healing differ on the exact beginning and ending points of the addition. (See Maisch, _Gelähmten_, pp. 39-43, and the literature cited there.) My division points are made not in reference to the development of the tradition but rather to the rhetorical structure of the final text. They will be discussed in more detail below.

[2] It should be recalled that "interposition" is a literary device describing something foreign or different "interposed" into a pericope or story. (See above, pp. 56-57). The term is a description of the structure of the final text and implies nothing about the tradition history or redaction of a pericope. To my knowledge, only Minette de Tillesse (_Secret_, p. 118); Kelber (_Kingdom_, pp. 18-19); and Kee (_Community_, p. 35) call attention to this "interposition" as a literary procedure common in Mark.

Rhetorical Analysis of the Individual Elements

Verses 1-2. The opening of the story is itself an abrupt break in the plot line from the preceding pericope. The first chapter of Mark ends with Jesus' healing the leper, and the leper spreading the news "so that Jesus could no longer openly enter a town, but was out in the country; and people came to him from every quarter" (1:45b). Mark 2 opens with Jesus returning to Capernaum. According to the gospel of Mark, the first thing Jesus does after not being able openly to enter a city is to enter a city. The contrast (or contradiction) emphasizes the new narrative beginning.[3]

Yet Mark 2:1-2 is carefully tied to 1:45 by the use of three hook words (or hook phrases) presented in chiastic order:[4]

1:45 τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι...εἰσελθεῖν
2:1-2 εἰσελθὼν...ὥστε μηκέτι...τὸν λόγον

These are the only two occurrences of the phrase ὥστε μηκέτι in Mark, and the first two uses of λόγος which does not recur until 4:14. Thus the reader/hearer is presented with a sharp disjunction in content[5] and by means of the hook words, continuity in sound. The audience is given the double message: Mark 2:1 is a break in the narrative and a new beginning; at the same time, the content following the break is in some way related to the material preceding it.

---

[3] So Weiss (Evangelium, pp. 153-154). The return to Capernaum is motiveless; the author is making an entirely new beginning.

[4] Sundwall, Zusammensetzung, p. 12.

It is conceivable, of course, that hook words occur here simply to bridge or form a transition between otherwise disparate material. That in fact they indicate some interrelationship of the material in Mark 1 and 2 is confirmed by the number of other words in 2:1-2 that recall the first chapter. Πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ reminds the reader of the first time Jesus entered Capernaum (1:21). The "house" presumably refers to Simon and Andrew's house in Capernaum which Jesus first entered in 1:29. On that occasion, the whole city gathered (ἐπισυνάγω) "at the door" (1:33); on this occasion, so many gathered (συνάγω) that there was no room "even at the door" (2:2). The numbers of people seeking out Jesus have steadily increased in the interval.[6]

Mark 2:1-2 is a typical introductory or transition scene, complete in itself. Jesus appears at some place; a crowd, variously described, collects around Jesus; and Jesus teaches them--here, "speaks the word"--without any specific teaching being given.[7]

---

[5] Grammatically also, εἰσελθῶν is an anacoluthon.

[6] So Swete (*Mark*, p. 32), Taylor (*Mark*, p. 193), Maisch (*Gelähmten*, p. 14). See Mk 1:37, 45.

[7] The same formula appears in 2:13; 4:1-2a; 6:(30)32-34 and 10:1. Variants may be found in 1:21; 3:7-8,20; 5:21; 6:1-2,6b and possibly

The little scene emphasizes both Jesus' popularity with the crowd--that the people sought him out--and that Jesus' typical response on such occasions was to teach them.[8]

In this instance, the summary scene also sets the stage for the episode to follow. Mark's audience knows that Jesus is in a house, and that the doorway is blocked by people. The audience is prepared for the coming story in which people will dig through the roof as the only way to approach Jesus.

Thus, vv. 1-2 accomplish multiple functions in terms of the narrative of Mark. From the abrupt shift in setting from 1:45, from the hook words and the other ties to chapter one, the hearer knows that there has been a definite break in the narrative, and also some connection to what went before. Jesus' popularity and teaching activity have been stressed. And the scene has been set for the next event. A great deal has been packed into these two transition verses.

Verses 3-5. These verses do not continue with the content of Jesus' "word," but begin the healing narrative proper. Verses 3-4 are full of picturesque detail, often characteristic of the miracle form.[9] Four people carrying a paralytic cannot reach Jesus "on account

---

6:53-55(56). Matthew sometimes has a similar little scene--but in his, Jesus heals rather than teaches. See Mt 12:15; 14:13-14 (parallel to Mk 6:32-34); 15:29-30; 19:1-2 (parallel to Mk 10:1).

[8] Schweizer ("Anmerkungen," pp. 37-38) notes Mark's stress on Jesus teaching activity, but not its connection with crowds coming to Jesus.

[9] Taylor (Mark, p. 192) notes the vividness of the style of the

of the crowd". Here, for the first time, Mark uses the word ὄχλος. So, the four with the paralytic climb the roof, dig through it, and lower the paralytic upon his pallet before Jesus.[10] Jesus responds by addressing the sick man directly: "Child, your sins are forgiven."

Verses 6-10a, the interposition. Verse 6 presents another abrupt plot shift. The story is interrupted to inform the hearer that there were some scribes present in the house who wonder about Jesus' statement. For the moment, the paralytic is forgotten, and Jesus holds a theological debate with the scribes. Then in v. 10b, equally abruptly, employing an anacoluthon, the plot shifts back. The scribes are forgotten, and Jesus is speaking to the paralytic. Jesus' two addresses to the paralytic serve as a frame for the interposition:

v 5: λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Τέκνον, ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι

vv 10b-11a: λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν
κράββατόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου

A frame, it may be remembered, is defined as something which frames another unit at its beginning and its end, but which itself is not part of the unit framed.[11] In the final narrative, both speeches

---

miracle portions, vv. 3-5a,11-12, as an argument for the composite history of the pericope. Actually the vividness is found in vv. 1-4 while the remainder of the pericope is heavily repetitive. The change in style does not correspond to the change in form-critical type.

[10] The narrative does not tell us how space was found in the midst of the people for the pallet. The attention is now focused on Jesus and the sick man.

[11] See above, p. 57.

to the sick man are not part of the theological debate with the scribes, but are part of the healing in which the scribes do not appear. The repetition of λέγε τῷ παραλυτικῷ may or may not indicate compilation of sources or traditions.[12] The repetition does, however, function for the hearer as a frame to block off the theological debate from the healing, and it also functions to stress the parallelism of the two speeches to the paralytic.

The interposition itself is a nicely balanced unit making extensive use of repetition for varying purposes. The text laid out to reveal its structure will help to illustrate the point:

6 ἦσαν δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι
ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν,

7 Τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; Βλασφημεῖ·
τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός;

8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγει αὐτοῖς,

Τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;
9 τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον,
εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,
ἢ εἰπεῖν, Ἔγειρε καὶ ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει;

10 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι
ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς--

The scribes, new characters on the scene, are described debating in their hearts two unspoken questions beginning with τί and τίς respectively (vv. 6-7). Then Jesus is described knowing that the scribes are debating among themselves, and responds with two spoken counter-questions, both beginning with τί (vv. 8-9). The scribes first question why Jesus speaks like this; Jesus first asks why the scribes debate these things. So far the form and content are parallel to each other.

---

[12] So William Wrede, "Zur Heilung des Gelähmten (Mc 2, 1ff.)" *ZNW* (1904) 354-358; Bultmann (*History*, pp. 14-16); Taylor (*Mark*, pp. 191-192). For arguments and literature pro and con a composite pericope, see Maisch, *Gelähmten*, pp. 21-39.

Jesus' second question introduces a new element: "Is it easier to say to the paralytic, 'your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'rise and take up your bed and walk?'" (v. 9). Of course, it is as easy--or as hard--to say the one as to say the other.[13] The counter-question may serve to emphasize that the two sayings are in fact equivalent in meaning.[14] Finally, however, Jesus does answer the scribes' questions directly:[15]ἵνα δε εἰδῆτε. Οὗτος--the one they spoke of contemptuously[16]--is in fact the Son of man (vv. 7a,10); he is able (δύναται v. 7b); he has authority (ἐξουσίαν v 10a) to forgive sins

---

[13] So Morna D. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark (London: SPCK, 1967), pp. 87-88.

[14] Budesheim ("Jesus," p. 193) writes, "In fact, the question: 'Which is easier?' virtually identifies the two."

[15] Interpreting ἵνα in the more usual final sense, "in order that," "so that." So Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p. 378; Blass-Debrunner-Funk,Sect. 470(3). For 2:10 as a periphrasis for the imperative, see C.J. Cadoux,"The Imperatival Use of ἵνα in the New Testament" JTS 42 (1941) 173; Lane, Mark, p. 97.

[16] Οὗτος may carry a connotation of contempt (Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p. 600). So here, Taylor, Mark, p. 195; Dennis Eric Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark (Pelican Gospel Commentary; Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 96; Lane, Mark, p. 96.

(ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας vv. 7b and 10a) on earth. He is the one besides God who forgives. The implication is clear: if one accepts the authority of the Son of man, what Jesus speaks is not blasphemy. The interposition is completed. The presence of the scribes and the theological argument over who may forgive are ended.

Verses 10b-12. The story, however, is not. Without grammatical transition, the healing is resumed. Jesus commands the paralytic by word to rise and take up his pallet. The paralytic does so and leaves. Then the reaction of the crowd is given.[17] The action of the paralytic and the response of the people are joined by the repetition of the hook word πάντων/πάντας: the paralytic went out before everyone so everyone is amazed (v. 12). The story ends with the crowd glorifying God.

The Ring Composition as a Rhetorical Unit

The devices giving unity to the theological debate, the interposition or middle part of the ring composition have already been noted: the addresses to the paralytic framing the interposition; the shift in content; the balanced questions and counter-questions of the scribes and Jesus, and finally, in v. 10a, Jesus' direct answer, introduced as such, to the scribes' questions.

---

[17] The typical conclusion to a miracle (Bultmann, History, p. 225).

Likewise the outer parts of the ring, the beginning and ending healing segments, have their own unity and balance--in this instance introverted parallelism.[18] The healing begins with the crowd pressing around Jesus; into this scene the paralytic is lowered upon his pallet. The healing ends with the paralytic rising, and leaving carrying his pallet; the crowd then responds, "We have never seen anything like this." The crowd brackets the coming and going of the paralytic, but plays no part at all in the interposition.

Word repetition serving to unify the ring composition. Further, the parts of the ring composition are rhetorically interconnected. The junctures between the healing and the debate are bridged at the beginning and end by the repetition of hook phrases: the content of the first address to the paralytic is repeated in the debate and the reverse occurs at the other end. Unlike the hook words which connect 2:1-2 with 1:45 which provide continuity of sound but not narrative or content continuity, the hook phrases here provide continuity in content as well as aural continuity.[19] Jesus' declaration of the forgiveness of sins to the paralytic gives way to the scribes' question over who has the ability to forgive sins (vv. 5-7). Jesus' question to the scribes, "is it easier...to say, rise and take up your pallet," leads into Jesus' command to the paralytic to rise and take up his pallet (vv. 9-11). The repetitions serve to interconnect the narrative--and the thought--of the interposition and the outer ring.

---

[18] Maisch (*Gelähmten*, p. 56) recognizes the concentric structure of the healing narrative--as she reconstructs it prior to the "interpolation" of the apophthegmatic material.

[19] In 1:45 it is the leper who spreads the word; in 2:2, Jesus speaks the word. Ὥστε μηκέτι introduces in the first instance, Jesus entering a town, and in the second, space around the door. Εἰσελθεῖν refers in both cases to Jesus entering a city/Capernaum; in 1:45 Jesus cannot do so openly, and in 2:1 he does so.

The second juncture, that between the debate and the completion of the healing, is especially complex because there is the grammatical disjunction of the anacoluthon *and* the continuity in thought. The first direct coupling of forgiveness and the command to rise occurs entirely within the debate (v. 9). The second bridges the anacoluthon (vv. 10-11), and is only fully completed when the paralytic rises and collects his pallet in v. 12. The debate is set off from the healing, but at the same time interwoven with it.

Word repetitions serving other functions. Λέγω in connection with Jesus speaking, serves as a key word or motif bringing out the thought of the pericope.[20] Three times Jesus engages in Jesus' direct speech: in the frame before the apophthegm, he *says* to the paralytic; near the middle of the apophthegm, he *says* to the scribes; and in the frame after the apophthegm, he *says* to the paralytic (vv. 5,8,10b). In all three instances the form is λέγει. These uses do help to structure the composition. In addition, Jesus uses the word three times in direct discourse: Jesus asks the scribes if it is easier to

---

[20] The use of λέγοντας in v. 12 referring to the people is the transition to their direct speech, and appears irrelevant to the use of the word in regard to Jesus.

UMI

say this or to *say* that (εἰπεῖν both times, v. 9). He does not ask which is easier to do or accomplish And finally, Jesus opens his second address to the paralytic with the emphatic *and* redundant Σοὶ λέγω (v. 11). The emphasis throughout is on Jesus' speaking or saying. Jesus is the one who speaks; since the paralytic does rise, Jesus' words may indeed be words of power.[21]

The use of λαλέω might be seen as part of the motif of Jesus as speaker. In v. 2, Jesus "was speaking the word" to the crowd.[22] However, the second use of the word suggests that its function may be to point up contrast. After Jesus has told the paralytic his sins are forgiven, the scribes debate (silently): Τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; Βλασφημεῖ; (v. 7). This use of λαλέω —which could be omitted without affecting the sense of the line[23]—recalls v. 2. On the one hand, Jesus speaks

---

[21] James M. Robinson (*The Problem of History in Mark* [SBT 21; London: SCM Press, 1957], pp. 44-45) suggests that the model for the markan debates is to be found in the exorcisms. Certainly, in this healing controversy, the stress is on Jesus' word, just as Jesus exorcises demons by word. Geza Vermes (*Jesus the Jew* [London: Collins, 1973], p. 24) points out that healings, unlike exorcisms, are usually accomplished with the aid of some physical means--often touch. (See Mk 1:31,41; 3:10; 5:23,28-30,41; 6:5,13,56; 7:33; 8:23-25; 9:27.) The fact that this healing is by word alone confirms that the emphasis in this pericope is on the power of Jesus' word.

[22] 'Ελάλει τὸν λόγον. Λόγος, it may be recalled, is a hook word to 1:45. It may be for this reason that Mark has used "to speak the word" here instead of the more usual "he was teaching" or "he began to teach" found in pericope introductions. See 2:13; 4:1-2a; 6:32-34; 10:1. Aside from this instance, the expression "to speak the word" is found in 4:33 and 8:32, neither of which is in a pericope introduction.

[23] So Mt 9:3.

"the word,"--that is, the gospel or good news. On the other, what the scribes hear him speak is "blasphemy." Here, for the first time in Mark, the reader (and Jesus) are made aware that there is opposition to Jesus and his message. The opposition is still tentative: it is only "some of the scribes" (v. 6); they only debate in their hearts, not out loud (vv. 6,8a,b); they do not yet question Jesus or his disciples directly; they are still far from the point of moving against Jesus. But opposition has arisen. And the basis for the opposition concerns a fundamental matter: Jesus is either speaking for/as God when he says, "Your sins are forgiven," or, as the story is told, he is speaking blasphemy.[24] There is no possible compromise.

Nor, as the story is told, is compromise or evasion Jesus' way. Rather he asserts directly that the Son of man has authority on earth (v. 10a). Here repetition is used in yet a different way to highlight the Son of man saying. The saying is almost entirely surrounded by repetitive material--that is, information already known to the reader. Three times we have been told that the scribes are debating in their hearts; four times we are told about forgiveness of sins; three times we hear about the paralytic rising and taking up his pallet, first in a question, then in a command to the paralytic, and finally in the report that the paralytic does so. In the midst of all this reiteration,[25] the statement that the Son of man has authority on earth stands out. The effect of the repetitiveness is to stress the new information--the Son of man saying.[26] Neither the scribes within the story nor the reader hearing the story is likely to miss Jesus' claim. Either Jesus has legitimate authority as the Son of man or he is blaspheming; the scribes--and the audience--must choose.

---

[24] For the purposes of the story, it does not matter whether or not Jesus is technically blaspheming under Jewish law (here or in 14:62). (See Haenchen, Weg, p. 102.) What matters is whether the audience perceives Jesus speaking blasphemy or good news.

However, although no middle ground is possible, the issue need not yet be joined. The use of the ring composition technique enables the narrator to revert to the healing, thereby avoiding immediate confrontation on the issue of Jesus' authority, while still completing the story. The issue of the grounds for conflict have been stated, but the conflict does not yet dominate the stage. This is confirmed by the response of the people at the end of the story. They are amazed and glorify God (not Jesus) saying they have never seen anything like this. They react to the healing/forgiving of the paralytic, not to the conflict with the scribes.[27]

---

[25] The repetition also contains variations, possibly for stylistic effect. The scribes debate "in their hearts" or "among themselves." The paralytic is to rise, take up his pallet--and walk, or go home, or go out in front of them all.

[26] Donahue (The Christ, pp. 81-82, 241) interprets the repetition as examples of what he calls "the markan insertion technique." (See above, pp. 35-36). 2:7-8a is inserted between the first and third statements about the scribes debating; 2:10 is inserted between the first and second statements about "rise, take up your bed." The inserted material is first, the charge of blasphemy along with the saying on who can forgive, and second, the affirmation of the power of the Son of man over sin. For Donahue, the double use of the insertion technique in this pericope calls attention to the inserted material, which is of great theological significance for Mark (Ibid, p. 82). Thus Donahue sees his "insertions" in terms of markan redaction and theological concern. He fails to account for the full extent of the repetition. Looking at his "insertions" from a rhetorical perspective, it may be said that repetitious material, when it frames new material, may serve to highlight the new material. This seems indeed to be the case with the new material Donahue sees Mark adding. The second highlighted saying, the Son of man statement, answers the questions posed first in v. 7. This is clearly good narrative technique. How much it may demonstrate markan additions to the text or his theological concerns would remain to be determined.

Summary of the rhetorical analysis. The rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-12 has shown it to be a carefully constructed narrative that fits together into a literary whole. The introduction brings out both the discontinuity and the continuity of the following material with Mark 1. The employment of the ring composition, the healing encircling the debate, enables the narrator to reinforce the parallelism of forgiveness of sins and healing, and to raise separately the question of Jesus' authority (to heal/forgive?).

The frame-interposition technique also in effect brackets the theme of opposition to Jesus within the already-established theme of his popularity. Hostility to Jesus' healing/forgiving activity--and its implied claim--is made known to the reader by the objections of the scribes in the center. The popularity of Jesus is reflected in the crowd streaming to him at the beginning of the narrative and in their response to the miracle at the end. By means of the interposition, the hostility toward Jesus by the scribes and the popularity of Jesus with the crowd are placed side by side before the reader, in tension with each other. The reader is aware of both characters--the scribes and the crowd; the reader knows that the same words/deeds of Jesus aroused both serious opposition and immense popularity. The interposition blocked off by a frame has been used to separate the reactions of the scribes and the crowd. Neither character is shown dominating the course of the whole narrative; each is dominant in its own portion.[28] So the reader is left to keep both (conflicting) realities in mind. He is not told how to reconcile the two, or which, if either, will eventually prevail.

---

[27] Similarly, when the crowd witnesses exorcisms, they do not respond (or apparently acknowledge hearing) the titles the demons bestow on Jesus, but respond only to the act of exorcism (1:23-27; 5:1-20). Passages such as 1:34 and 3:11-12 suggest that the crowd could hear the demons quite as easily as they could hear Jesus' sayings in vv. 8b-10.

Lastly, the motif of Jesus' speaking (keyword λέγω , see also λαλέω) is found throughout the ring composition. It stresses the power of Jesus' word and also points to the basis of the conflicting attitudes toward Jesus: is Jesus' word from/of God or not?

Exegetical Notes on Mark 2:1-12

Rhetorical analysis as a methodology does not claim to answer all exegetical questions. Since its concern is with the final text, it is not designed to answer historical questions of tradition and redaction, although upon occasion it may offer additional arguments. A rhetorical analysis should, however, shed light on how a text is to be understood. If it is a useful tool, it should resolve some exegetical problems.

---

[28] The emphasis in a ring composition is not necessarily on the center. See above, pp. 64-66.

Above all, it should serve as a control limiting the possible ways in which a text may be interpreted.

The following discussion, then, indicates some ways in which the rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-12 may aid or clarify its exegesis. The story of the paralytic with its interwoven theological debate is a good test case for the usefulness of the rhetorical method since the story bristles with form-critical and exegetical difficulties. The relevance of the rhetorical analysis to three areas will be discussed: first, the stylistic or narrative "clumsiness" of the passage; second, the relation of forgiveness to healing; and third, the occurrence of "Son of man" in v. 10.

Stylistic and narrative "clumsiness." Many scholars have noted the "clumsy" style of the pericope--the "awkward"[29] repetition of λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ in vv. 5 and 10; the fact that the scribes are not introduced into the story until v. 6; the grammatical disjunction of v. 10; the fact that the ending appears to have nothing to do with the debate, and that the hostile scribes, instead of reacting to Jesus' claim in v. 10a, appear to be among the "all" who glorify God in v. 12. And most have explained this "clumsiness" on the grounds that at some point in the development of the pericope the apophthegmatic material was interpolated into a simple healing story.[30]

---

[29] So Taylor, Formation, p. 66.

[30] So, for example, Bultmann, History, pp. 14-15; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 50; Taylor, Mark, p. 192; Maisch, Gelähmten, p. 29; Hultgren,

In fact, most of the so-called literary "difficulties" of the narrative are the result of the failure of the critics to recognize the literary structure of the passage, its ring composition. The repetition of λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ within the rhetorical pattern is an effective aural device (conscious or unconscious) to call the reader's attention to the parallelism of Jesus' two addresses to the paralytic, and to frame the debate in the center.

The fact that the scribes do not appear until v. 6 and have disappeared completely in the ending is also the result of the ring composition. In a and a', the characters are Jesus, the crowd, and the paralytic; in b, the interposition, the characters are Jesus and the scribes. Thus each part of the story conforms to Olrik's law of no more than three characters. The paralytic is the subject of the debate, but not at that point a character in the plot.[31] Since the scribes play an active role only in b, it is appropriate that they should be introduced at the beginning of it (v. 6), and fade out at the end. The "character" who responds to the healing in a' is the "character" who witnessed the beginning in a, the crowd. The "all"

"Adversaries," p. 201. For scholars who do not see it as a mixed form, see Daube, New Testament, pp. 170-175; Richard T. Mead, "The Healing of the Paralytic--A Unit?" JBL 80 (1961) 351-354, following Daube (and Dibelius); and Kolenkow, "Healing Controversy," pp. 635-636. Dibelius views the form as a "pure" paradigm, but he does believe that the preacher added the middle verses (Tradition, pp. 43, 66-67).

[31] The fact that the paralytic is not an active character in the debate confirms the earlier conclusion that the first as well as the second address of Jesus to the paralytic is part of the healing ring and not of the apophthegm.

of v. 12 recalls the "many" of v. 2. The crowd's response also fits with the ring composition: they react to the miracle, a and a′, their part of the story, and not to the content of the debate with the scribes.

The grammatical difficulties of v. 10 remain. The shift from direct to indirect discourse is not necessarily clumsy: it is permissible Greek[32] and both Matthew and Luke keep the basic syntax.[33] As E. Lohmeyer writes, "wie sollte der Erzähler ein Wort an den Lahmen anders einführen."[34] The result, however, is to bind the interposition closely to its setting, which does produce a problem. "That you may know" in v. 10a, addressed to the scribes, implies clearly that they witness the healing described in vv. 11-12a, and so form part of the "all" of v. 12.[35] Nonetheless, the reaction of "all" in v. 12

---

[32] So Blass-Debrunner-Funk, Sect. 470(3); the sentence is elided, with "I will say this" to be supplied. Farrer writes, "What is there to complain of here? The effect is magnificent, and could not be bettered" (Mark, p. 76).

[33] Mk 9:6 softens the construction with τότε. Lk 5:24 is similar to Mark.

[34] Markus, p. 50, fn. 2.

[35] Since the opposition to Jesus is just beginning to be brought forward in the narrative, it is possible of course that Mark intends the "all" to include the scribes in amazement. So Lane, Mark, p. 99. It seems to me more probable that Mark is careless at this point. Or is the "all" designed to strike the reader and call attention to the contrast in attitude between the scribes who charge blasphemy and everybody who glorifies God? See Budesheim, "Jesus," p. 190.

appears to be a typical crowd response to a miracle--what one would expect given the circular structure of the pericope. The scribes are no longer in the narrator's mind.[36]

Thus rhetorical analysis can offer an explanation for most of the stylistic phenomena which have been deemed awkward and been adduced as evidence for interpolation or two-stage historical development. The rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-12 reveals the present text to be a literary unity, a carefully constructed ring composition in which the outer parts and the center are extensively interwoven and in which these stylistic phenomena have their place. Of course, the rhetorical explanation of the phenomena does not exclude the possibility of an interpolation; it simply means that stylistic clumsiness is not a valid reason for arguing for an interpolation. It is not clumsy.

The relationship between forgiveness and healing. Only here in the synoptic tradition is forgiveness associated with healing;[37] and only here and in the story in Luke 7:36-50 about the sinful woman annointing Jesus' feet does Jesus explicitly forgive (or announce forgiveness). So exegetes have been troubled to explain why the issue of forgiveness is debated in the midst of a healing narrative. The question may perhaps best be approached through a consideration of the form of the pericope. Bultmann considered it a mixed form, part apophthegm and part miracle story.[38] He argued that the subject matter of forgiveness was interpolated into an ordinary healing narrative in which Jesus' only command to the paralytic was the command to rise and take up his pallet.[39] According to this interpretation, both the fact that Jesus forgives and the question about his authority to do so belong to the controversy apophthegm. For Bultmann, the apophthegm is inserted into a healing narrative so that the miracle may serve as proof of the otherwise "invisible" forgiveness. There is no inherent connection between healing and forgiveness. In this understanding, the controversy is about forgiveness and the right to forgive, and the miracle functions as Jesus' final, triumphant retort. The story, strictly speaking, would not be a healing controversy in form since the conflict is not about healing.

---

[36] Perhaps the most famous example in Mark of the ability of characters --in this case the crowd--to disappear and appear without benefit of orderly exits and entrances may be found in 4:1-36. In the narrative of the healing of the paralytic, the four who carried him are apparently abandoned still standing on the roof after lowering Jesus through it.

[37] But see John 5:14.

Dibelius, on the other hand, does not view the pericope as a mixed or hybrid form. He classifies it as a paradigm of the "pure" type, not as a miracle tale.[40] Dibelius' classification scheme does not concern us; his analysis of the pericope that led to his classification does. Dibelius like Bultmann divides the narrative into two content issues. However, he makes the split between healing and the fact of forgiveness on the one side, and the issue of the right to forgive sins on the other:[41] "The first issue, forgiveness of sins, or healing, is crossed by a second: Who can forgive sins?"[42] In this view, the miracle is not an extraneous act brought in to justify the forgiveness; rather the argument moves from Jesus′ healing/forgiving activity to his authority to heal/forgive. The outer story tells the miracle, the center deals with the "worth of the miracle worker."[43] Here we have a healing controversy of the second type, with the healing at the end. The controversy, in this understanding, is like the other healing controversies in Mark (3:1-6, 22-30) in that the controversy is over some aspect of Jesus′ healing, acting unlawfully on the sabbath, or acting by the power of Beezebul not God.

---

[38] Bultmann treats the pericope both under apophthegms and under miracles. (History, pp. 14-16, 212-213.)

[39] Ibid., pp. 14-16. Bultmann is arguing for a two-stage development of the pericope by the community. My interest is not in the history of development, but in the form of the existing text, whenever and by whomever it came into existence.

[40] Tradition, p. 43.

To this day, the large majority of scholars agrees with Bultmann, not Dibelius.[44] However, the rhetorical analysis of the pericope indicates that Dibelius was correct.[45] The outer ring includes both healing and forgiveness;[46] the interposition contains the debate about Jesus' authority to forgive. Healing and forgiveness are equated both in the outer ring by means of the two parallel addressed to the paralytic, and in the center by the question to the scribes, "Which is easier to say...." Since forgiveness is essentially equated with healing, virtually as a healing formula,[47] the

---

[41] Dibelius (Ibid., pp. 66-67) never specifically calls the declaration of forgiveness a healing formula. Rather he consistently places them in parallel, and writes, "That Jesus should, by the healing, confirm the forgiveness of sins, corresponds to Jewish views of the connection between sin and illness" (Ibid., p. 66).

[42] Ibid., p. 66. [43] Ibid., p. 67.

[44] Major independent studies of Mk 2:1-12 which come to the same opinion as Bultmann include Taylor, Mark, pp. 191-192,197; Minette de Tillesse, Secret, pp. 116-117; Hultgren "Adversaries," pp. 200-202; Maisch, Gelähmten, p. 49. Johnson (Mark, p. 55) asserts that Dibelius

---

was correct. For views similar to Dibelius, see Budesheim, "Jesus," p. 192; Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," p. 159, Kolenkow, "Healing Controversy," p. 630; Vermes, Jesus, p. 180.

[45] The historical probability of Dibelius' position has also been advanced by the find at Qumran of the Prayer of Nabonidus in which forgiveness of sins functions as a healing formula. So Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," p. 159. Kenzo Tagawa (Miracles et Évangile [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966], pp. 40-41) argues, unconvincingly I believe, that forgiveness as a healing formula was a special instance for Nabonidas, a pagan, and not a general healing formula.

[46] The rhetorical analysis is of course based on the final text, but then a form-critical analysis must also begin with that text. It would seem that most critics have some preconviction that forgiveness and healing have no integral association. The one argument adduced that suggests that the miracle may have once existed without any mention of forgiveness is that the story reads as a complete miracle narrative when vv. 5b-10 are omitted. Equally, it would read as a complete miracle when vv. 6-11 are omitted. This fact may also be explained as the consequence of the circular rhetorical structure used (as distinct from the action-objection-vindication controversy form). However, if the miracle did exist independently, then whenever the controversy was added, the association of forgiveness with healing appears to have been assumed and thus used as a lead-in to the controversy over Jesus' authority to forgive.

[47] Contra Tagawa (Miracles, pp. 40-41), the fact that forgiveness can be a healing formula does not need to imply that all sickness is due to sin, only that some sickness is due to sin.

healing naturally confirms the reality of forgiveness.[48] It is not an extraneous display of power or an a minori ad majus proof, but the expected outcome of the authoritative statement, "Your sins are forgiven."[49]

The occurrence of "Son of man" in v. 10. Perhaps the most debated issue in scholarship on Mark 2:1-12 is the question of how to understand the use of Son of man in v. 10. It is the first use of the term in Mark; it is not prepared for in the text; it is not explained. The Son of man as pardoner of sins does not occur elsewhere in the synoptic or Jewish tradition. Further, Mark 2:10 and 28 (and par) are the only instances in the synoptic tradition which refer to the earthly authority of the Son of man. Unlike many later uses of the title, the use here is public, before hostile witnesses. And the term does not occur again after 2:28 in Mark until 8:31 in the first passion prediction. Scholars have felt that 2:10 is in need of explaining.[50]

---

[48] The response of the crowd that they have never seen anything like this also suggests that the forgiveness should be associated with the healing and not with the debate. For in the larger markan narrative, this crowd in Capernaum presumably includes those who witnessed the synagogue exorcism and who brought their sick and possessed to Jesus at sundown (1:27-28, 32-34). If the sequence and context of the whole narrative is to be taken seriously, this crowd at 2:12 is seeing something which goes beyond what they saw earlier. The inclusion of the forgiveness formula suggests that they witness a healing of sickness caused by God (the consequence of sin) in contrast to the exorcisms in which the sickness is caused by evil powers. See Best, Temptation, pp. 35-36, passim.

[49] Hooker (Son of Man, p. 89) presents a somewhat similar view of the miracle.

Rhetorical analysis of the individual story of the healing of the paralytic can offer some limits to possible explanations of Mark 2:10. It can affirm that the title as a title is indeed unheralded in the narrative--unlike Christ or Son of God. At the same time it must affirm that the narrative as it now stands in Mark stresses the phrase "the Son of man has authority on earth." It is made to stand out and given emphasis by all the repetitive material surrounding it. If this use of Son of man is "unmarkan" then it must be said that Mark has left the text with the phrase strangely prominent. The audience would be unlikely to ignore it.

Rhetorical analysis of the pericope also has the negative use of eliminating as a possibility one explanation of v. 10 that many scholars have recently put forward. Here is a clear instance of rhetorical analsyis serving as a control. Many have attempted to resolve the problems of 2:10 and the passage as a whole by saying that the phrase, "but that you may know that the Son of man has authority to forgive sins on earth" (v. 10a) is a parenthetical aside by Mark to his Christian readers over the head of the scribes. In their opinion, the "you" of εἰδῆτε refers not to the scribes whom Jesus is apparently addressing, but to the Christian audience of the gospel. This view has been recently and independently advocated by scholars of such diverse viewpoints and traditions as C.E.B. Cranfield,[51] E. Trocmé,[52] E.J. Mally,[53] W.L. Lane,[54] and N. Perrin.[55]

---

[50] The literature on the Son of man "problem" and 2:10 is immense. For recent literature which views 2:10 as premarkan, see Heinz Edward Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition (trans. Dorothea M. Barton; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 125-130; Hooker, Son of Man, pp. 81-93; Maisch, Gelähmten, pp. 90-101. For views of 2:10 and 28 as part of Mark's theology, see Perrin, "The Creative Use of the Son of Man Traditions in Mark" in A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974) pp. 84-93); "The Christology of Mark," pp. 173-187; John H. Elliott, "Man and the Son of Man in the Gospel according to Mark," Humane Gesellschaft (eds. Trutz Rendtorff and Arthur Rich; Zurich: Zwingli, 1970), pp. 50-58. For a recent attempt to interpret Son of man not as a title but as meaning "man", see Lewis S. Hay, "The Son of Man in Mark 2:10 and 2:28," JBL 89 (1970) 69-75.

This view is attractive since it explains why the term is used so early in the gospel, why it is used in a public address to opponents, and why the reaction in v. 12 takes no account of the saying.[56] And Mark does use the device of parenthetical addresses to his reader.[57]

---

[51] The Gospel According to Saint Mark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 100.

[52] Formation, p. 173. [53] "Mark," pp. 11, 26-27.

[54] Mark, pp. 26-27, 97-98. Lane follows G.H. Boobyer, "Mark II, 10a, and the Interpretation of the Healing of the Paralytic," HTR 47 (1954) 115-120. See also C.P. Ceroke, "Is Mark 2:10 a saying of Jesus?" CBQ 22 (1960) 369-390.

[55] "The High Priest's Question and Jesus' Answer" in Kelber, Passion, p. 92; "The Christology of Mark," p. 116, fn. 24.

[56] Hooker (Son of Man, p. 83) notes on the other hand that this interpretation also raises the difficulty of a reference to Jesus as Son of man not spoken by Jesus.

[57] See above, pp. 29-30.

However, the explanation cannot be valid for 2:10 since the saying forms an integral part of the rhetorical structure of the debate with the scribes found in vv. 6-10a.[58] It directly answers both questions posed by the scribes in v. 7, and is therefore addressed to them. The scribes now know that not only God but someone known as the Son of man claims to have (God's) authority on earth to forgive sins.

Seeing v. 10a as the answer to v. 7 also suggests a way the Christian readers of the story might have understood the unexplained and unheralded use of "Son of man." This chap who speaks blasphemy is actually, according to Jesus, the Son of man who has legitimate authority to forgive sins. And by means of the grammatical disjuncture in v. 10 and the emphatic Σοὶ λέγω to the paralytic, Jesus is clearly identified to the hearer as the Son of man. The ring structure results in the identification of the Son of man with Jesus without any direct statement to that effect in the narrative. Thus, the person who acts by forgiving/healing, this Jesus, is the "Son of man." This is sufficient definition for the narrative to be coherent. What other ideas Mark's readers and/or Mark held about the Son of man cannot be deduced from this pericope.[59]

---

[58] See above, pp. 121-123.

[59] Perrin ("The High Priest's Question," p. 90) writes, somewhat similarly: "Verses 2:10 and 2:28, the references to Jesus as Son of Man with exousia to forgive sins and to abrogate the Sabbath law, serve the function of equating the authority of Jesus with that of the Son of Man." Perrin's statement assumes, undoubtedly correctly, that Mark's audience has some preconceived ideas about the figure, "the Son of man."

Mark 2:13-17: The Call of Levi and Eating with Sinners

In terms of form, the pericope reports a controversy apophthegm of the usual action-objection-vindiction type. However, the form appears pushed out of shape by its abnormally long prologue. Not only is the narrative exposition part of the controversy form unusually long and redundant (vv. 15-16a), but it is prefaced by a general introduction (v. 13)[60] and the call of Levi (v. 14). Form critics have generally viewed 2:13 as editorial, 2:14 as a biographical apophthegm, some or all of v. 15 as editorial, and 2:17b as an attached saying.[61]

Moreover, the various elements of the pericope appear to be joined in an awkward manner; the narrative does not read smoothly. Scholars have not been impressed by the unity or coherence of this passage. C. Carlston, for example, writes that it is "fruitless to seek a literary or catechetical unity in vv. 13-17, since the connections are unclear and since some of the material probably comes from a pre-Markan collection in any case."[62]

---

[60] Schmidt (Rahmen, p. 82) classifies 2:13 as a Sammelbericht.

[61] So with some differences, Albertz, Streitgespräche, p. 6; Bultmann, History, pp. 18, 28, 92, 341; Taylor, Formation, p. 65; Taylor, Mark, pp. 201, 203; Hultgren, "Adversaries," pp. 208, 214-217; Budesheim, "Jesus," p. 203; B.M.F. Van Iersel, "La Vocation de Lévi," De Jésus aux Évangiles (ed. I. de la Potterie; BETL 25:2; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1967), pp. 212-232; Charles E. Carlston, The Parables of the Triple Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 111. Cf. Sundwall, Zusammensetzung, p. 16; Knox, Sources, Vol 1, p. 13; Rudolf Pesch, "Das Zöllnergastmahl (Mk 2,15-17)," Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.P. Béda Rigaux, (eds. Albert Descamps and André de Halleux; Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), pp. 63-87; Pesch, "Levi-Matthäus (Mc 2:14/Mt 9:9). Ein Beitrag zur Losung eines alten Problems," ZNW (1968) 43-45.

Yet, it is a presupposition of rhetorical criticism that literary analysis may be applied to any text, and that it may help us to understand that text. Indeed the following rhetorical analysis, while confirming (once again) that the narrative is rather disjointed, also shows, as in 2:1-12, careful intertwining of the elements of the pericope. Extensive use is made of verbal and content repetition in order to unify the passage, for emphasis, and to interrelate disparate material. Awareness of these rhetorical features helps to give unity or focus to the narrative as a whole. Each verse will first be discussed separately, then the passage as a whole considered.

Rhetorical Analysis of the Individual Elements

Verse 13. Verse 13, the introduction, is very similar in content and function to the introduction to the healing of the paralytic. Like 2:1-2, it is a typical introductory or transition scene, complete within itself: Jesus appears at some particular place, the crowd gathers around him, and Jesus teaches them.[63] Here the scene appears in its simplest version: only the words πάλιν and πᾶς could be eliminated and still have the scene complete.

Like 2:1-2, 2:13 reports an unmotivated shift in geography

---

[62] Parables, p. 113. [63] See above, pp. 118-119.

(setting), providing a new narrative beginning.[64] Unlike 2:1-2, however, 2:13 is not connected to the end of the preceding pericope by a chiastic pattern of hook words. Nor does the content of 2:13 run counter to the content of the preceding pericope, as 2:1-2 had Jesus entering a city immediately after being unable to enter one openly. Thus, in 2:13, the reader's attention is not called to a break in narrative continuity as it is in 2:1-2.[65]

And as in 2:1, the πάλιν in 2:13 refers the reader to a place Jesus has already been in Mark 1, παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν (1:16, 2:13). In 2:14, Jesus calls a disciple, just as the first time he was beside the sea, he called disciples.[66]

Verse 14. As commentators have frequently noted, 2:14, the call of Levi, is a call to discipleship similar to the calls of the brothers in 1:16-20, although the word "disciple" is not used in Mark until 2:15. Jesus calls a person working at his occupation; the person immediately follows Jesus.[67] As v. 13 is the simplest version of its general scene, so v. 14 is a barebones version of a call. Levi, the son of Alphaeus, is described only as sitting at the tax office and as getting up (καθήμενον/ἀναστὰς).[68] In 2:14, ἀκολουθέω is stressed, used both for Jesus' call and for Levi's response.

---

[64] David Blatherwick ("The Markan Silhouette?" NTS 17 [1970-71] 187) and Pierre Geoltrain ("La violation du Sabbat: Une lecture de Marc 3:1-6," Foi et Vie 69 [1970] 72) both interpret 2:13 as the first major break since 1:16. In both cases it appears due to undue reliance on the setting--Jesus beside the lake--in isolation from other factors.

[65] The opening words of 2:13, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν, echo in sound the opening words of 2:1, καὶ εἰσελθων πάλιν, and possibly also in content: Jesus went out (of Capernaum) beside the sea. This repetition may reinforce the reader's sense of continuity. Ἐξέρχομαι is of course a common markan editorial word (Gaston, Horae, p. 58). Mark may well have used the word simply to connect pieces of his tradition without any thought of it serving as part of a hook phrase to the beginning of 2:1. However, the reader may hear the similarity in sound and continuity in meaning, and consciously or unconsciously, connect the two openings.

[66] The entire verse also points ahead to the introductory scene of 4:1-2a where Jesus is again shown teaching the crowd beside the sea.

Verse 15. This verse presents a challenge for the rhetorical critic's ingenuity, for it has several syntactical ambiguities: whose house is referred to? Does the second πολλοί refer to the disciples or to the tax collectors and sinners? Is the subject of ἠκολούθουν the ambiguous many or the scribes of the Pharisees of v. 16?[69] Rhetorical criticism as a method may be an additional tool to help resolve such syntactical ambiguities.[70] By viewing the alternative grammatical possibilities from a rhetorical perspective, certain possibilities may be seen to fit the rhetorical pattern of a verse or passage better than others.

---

[67] The vocabulary of 2:14 also recalls 1:16-20. Καὶ παράγων, εἶδεν, ἠκολούθησεν(αν) αὐτῷ in v. 14 are all to be found in 1:16-20.

[68] Van Iersel ("Vocation," p. 216) lists six characteristics of call narratives of which he finds number five, abandonment of one's means of livelihood, lacking in the call of Levi. He may well be right not to interpret ἀναστὰς as that motif.

[69] The last question is actually a text-critical one. However, the evidence is sufficiently inconclusive that commentators tend to decide the issue on exegetical grounds. The United Bible Society Greek New Testament reads ἠκολούθουν with the scribes of the Pharisees with a certainty of "C," "considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading."

The basic procedure of rhetorical analysis is to observe rhetorical features in the text and argue from them to the understanding of the text. To attempt to use rhetorical criticism to clarify syntactical ambiguities in a text is to apply the method in reverse. One hypothesizes a particular understanding of the text into which one or another alternative then fits better rhetorically. Such a procedure is hazardous since it is projective and highly amenable to the subjective biases of the interpreter. The attempt, however, seems worth making.[71]

Verse 15 once again presents Jesus in a new place, indoors reclining at a meal in a house which may refer to Jesus' or to Levi's house.[72] A specific meal appears to be in progress. There would seem to be some rhetorical justification for considering Levi's house the more probable setting. First, Levi provides a narrative connection between vv. 14 and 15: Jesus calls Levi and then eats a meal in Levi's house just as earlier Jesus had called Simon and shortly thereafter ate at Simon's house (1:16-18, 29-31).[73]

---

[70] For example, Anthony R. Ceresko ("The Chiastic Word Pattern in Hebrew," CBQ 38 [1976] 303-311) argues for the use of the a:b::b:a word patterns as an aid in translation when a Hebrew text is obscure.

[71] The other option is to conclude that the passage does not make sense--to decide, with W.L. Knox (Sources, Vol. 1, p. 13) "here we have a hopeless obscurity." Knox may, of course, be correct.

[72] Most commentators opt for Levi's house. See the references cited by Carlston (Parables, p. 111, fn. 7). See also Pesch ("Zöllnergastmahl," pp. 64-65, 71) for Levi's house.

Second, the pleonasm of v. 15ab then serves a rhetorical function:

15a Καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

15b καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ
τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·

Verse 15a would picture two individuals, Levi and Jesus, dining; v. 15b extends the number dining to two whole groups, "many tax collectors and sinners," and "Jesus and his disciples."[74] In each case, there is an implied contrast between those viewed as sinful and those not.[75] The two groups are distinguished from each other.

In v. 15c, ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοι καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ, ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ at the end of this verse serves as a hook phrase recalling ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ at the end of v. 14.[76] The parallelism of content--following Jesus--as well as the verbal repetition[77] suggests that on rhetorical grounds the verb should be understood with the preceding material not with v. 16, and therefore its subject would be πολλοί.[78] The question remains, does πολλοί refer to the disciples or to the tax-collectors and sinners?[79]

---

[73] Weiss, Evangelium, p. 159.

[74] My interpretation draws on that of Van Iersel ("Vocation," p. 225). Verse 15ab might be considered an example of the markan tendency for "progressive double-step expression" (see Neirynck, Duality, pp. 71-72.) The two-step expression (if markan in this instance) may be due to editorial modification or amplification of tradition, or to direct composition.

[75] The question of what specific group, if any, the term "sinners" designated is not one that can be elucidated by the rhetorical approach. That would be a matter for historical investigation, and the referent might vary as a tradition traveled. See Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners" (CBQ 33 [1971] 39-61) and the literature cited there.

Rhetorically, v. 15 seems to make better sense if πολλοί is understood to refer to the disciples. Then the entire verse achieves some coherence. As 15b has extended 15a, Jesus' association with Levi to his association with many tax collectors and sinners, so 15c extends 15b, the number of disciples from the five individuals already named in the text who are following Jesus, to "many" who have responded to Jesus' call. The *many* tax collectors and sinners are balanced by the *many* disciples. Nor are the groups fixed: Levi began as a tax-collector and became a disciple.

---

[76] So Neirynck, *Duality*, p. 112; Van Iersel, "Vocation," p. 220.

[77] For hook word repetition without parallelism of content, see above on Mk 1:45 and 2:1-2 (pp. 117-118).

[78] So virtually all the versions and commentators. Cf. Swete, *Mark*, 41; N. Turner, *Style*, p. 18.

[79] Scholarly opinion is thoroughly divided. For arguments for "many" referring to tax collectors and sinners, see Swete, *Mark*, p. 41; C.H. Bird, "Some γαρ-clauses in St. Mark's Gospel," *JTS* 4 (1953) 182-183; Nigel Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1965), p. 65; Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 64. For arguments for "many" referring to disciples, see C.H. Turner, "Marcan Usage," *JTS* 26 (1925) 147; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 205; Trocmé, *Formation*, pp. 115-116.

The above understanding of v. 15 remains, of course, an hypothesis based on rhetorical considerations. The rhetorical argument, however, would be seen as support for the arguments of those scholars who see the theological importance of v. 15 in the extension from the individual specific case to everyone[80] and of those scholars who view 15c as an aside to the reader defining "disciples" and extending their number.[81]

Verse 16. Finally, in v. 16, the opponents appear on stage to ask their question.[82] The scribes of the Pharisees[83] ask the disciples a general question:[84] why Jesus eats with tax collectors and sinners. The participle ἰδόντες[85] connects the presence of the disciples with the meal described in v. 15. The phrasing of the verse stresses the involvement of the disciples in the narrative:

---

[80] See especially Van Iersel, "Vocation," pp. 225, 232. Paul Lamarche ("The Call to Conversion and Faith: The Vocation of Levi (Mk 2, 13-17)," Lumen Vitae 25 [1970] 301,303) argues that vv. 15-16 extend the call from one to many, and v. 17 extends it to all.

[81] See those cited in fn. 79 for "many" referring to disciples, and in addition, Nineham, Mark, p. 100; Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl," p. 65.

[82] The characters appear (and disappear) in the narrative as needed. See the discussion of the scribes in 2:1-12 above,

[83] Rhetorical analysis cannot elucidate the historical problem of who was meant by the scribes of the Pharisees. Rhetorically, the phrase recalls the scribes, the opponents of the first story, and points ahead to the Pharisees, the opponents of the later stories in this section. So Julius Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Marci (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1903), p. 19.

[84] Van Iersel, "Vocation," p. 217. Cf. Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl," pp. 71-73.

[85] Ἰδόντες, if taken literally, can raise questions of how the

> καὶ ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν
> ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,
> Ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;

The reader already knows from v. 15 that Jesus eats with tax collectors and sinners. In v. 16 the information is repeated twice again, in chiastic order (eats, sinners, tax collectors//tax collectors, sinners, eats). And interposed between the repetitions, the reader is told the opponents asked the disciples. The phrase stands out from the repetition surrounding it.

Verse 17. Verse 17 presents Jesus' answer in two parallel sayings of the form, οὐ...ἀλλὰ.... In each saying, two groups are contrasted: first the well and the sick, then the righteous and the sinners. The distinction between the two groups mirrors the distinction of v. 16 between the scribes of the Pharisees and the tax collectors and sinners, and the distinction implied in v. 16 and stated in v. 15 between Jesus and his disciples, on the one hand, and the tax collectors and sinners. Thus far, Jesus' answer builds upon the preceding narrative, contrasting two groups of people.

Neither saying, however, has any direct connection with the question of eating. The first saying, "Not the well but the sick have need of a doctor," is a generally applicable proverb. It applies to Jesus' associating with sinners, but it is hardly a specific

---

Pharisees saw Jesus in the house. Its function, however, does not appear to be accurate description, but rather narrative connection. The same might be said about ἀκούσας in v. 17.

justification of table fellowship.[86] The second saying, "I came not to call righteous ones but sinners," seems more clearly to justify the call of Levi in v. 14, than to justify the eating questioned in v. 16.[87] As in the call of James and John (1:20), so here in 2:17b, the verb καλέω is used.[88] In 2:17b, however, the call is not limited to Levi, or other particular individuals, but refers to sinners in general. The call, like the meal in v. 15, is extended from an individual to a general situation.

Verses 13-17 as a Rhetorical Unit

Verse 13 is a semi-detached scene preparing for what follows by placing Jesus beside the lake. Verses 14-17 are connected by the common subject matter of Jesus' relationship to tax collectors and sinners. In v. 14, Jesus calls Levi from his tax-office. In vv. 15-16, the fact that Jesus eats with tax-collectors and sinners is repeated three times. And finally in v. 17, Jesus announces his call to sinners. A formal pattern of repetition of the words τελώνιον/τελώνης and ἁμαρτωλός runs throughout the passage, providing a rhetorical continuity. First the tax office is mentioned alone; then both groups of people are mentioned three times, each time reversing the order, and finally the sinners are mentioned alone. The pattern is as follows:[89]

---

[86] Kolenkow (personal communication) has suggested that v. 17 might have been attached to 2:1-12. Cf. Carlston, Parables, p. 115.

[87] So Dibelius, Tradition, p. 64, fn. 1; Van Iersel, "Vocation," pp. 219, 226; Carlston, Parables, p. 115, fn. 29 (re Mark's theology).

[88] Καλέω is also used in 3:31 and 11:17. In neither instance does it refer to discipleship or eating. Καλέω can imply an invitation to a meal, but it does not do so in Mark, unless 2:17b is such an instance. So Lohmeyer (Markus, p. 56) and Mally ("Mark," p. 27) who view 17b as an invitation to the messianic banquet. If in fact the passage does imply the messianic banquet, the basis would seem to be found rather in v. 15ab, the actual meal. So Lane, Mark, p. 106.

x / x + y / y + x / x + y / y

Second, vv. 14-17 are connected by the interrelated themes of eating and calling. The two middle verses strongly stress Jesus' eating as well as his relationship to outcasts.[90] Twice in v. 15, Jesus is reclining at table (κατάκειμαι, συνανάκειμαι). Twice in v. 16, Jesus eats (ἐσθίει). On the other hand, neither v. 14 nor 17 explicitly mentions eating at all. Rather, v. 14 describes a specific call and v. 17 contains Jesus' affirmation that he came to call sinners. Thus, this pericope, like the healing of the paralytic, has a symmetrical rhythm of calling/eating/ calling.

Rhetorically, however, 2:13-17 is not a ring composition as is 2:1-12. Unlike healing and debate, the motifs of calling/following and eating are intertwined throughout the pericope. Verses 14 and 17, as noted, concern Jesus' call to discipleship. Verse 15c in the middle concerns following in discipleship.[91] Moreover, the disciples as a group are explicitly mentioned in connection with eating: in v. 15 they participate in the meal; in v. 16, they are asked about Jesus' behavior in eating with sinners. Thus the rather disjointed interweaving of narrative elements in vv. 14-17 serves, at the time of the first mention of "disciple" (v. 15) to define who a disciple is. A disciple is a person who is called by Jesus, who follows him, and who eats with him.

---

[89] Isaac Kikawada drew my attention to this pattern.

[90] Lamarche, "Call," p. 309.

Further, the disciples are defined in relation to other groups of people. A disciple may have been a sinner or tax collector before he accepted the call to discipleship (vv. 14, 17). The disciple, along with Jesus, eats with tax collectors and sinners (v. 15). Thus the disciples are both sinners themselves, and after their call to follow, still associate with sinners. And the opponents, by addressing their question to the disciples, acknowledge the disciples' relationship to Jesus.

The primary literary focus of the pericope remains on Jesus' behavior in calling and eating with sinners, and his concluding teaching. However, the employment of the discipleship motifs of calling and following, and the presence of the disciples throughout the pericope, serve to establish the disciples in the foreground of the narrative, in association with Jesus.

---

[91] Pesch ("Zöllnergastmahl," p. 87), and Van Iersel ("Vocation," pp. 220, 225-226), see vv. 14, 15c, and 17b connected with the call to discipleship in Mark's redaction.

Relation of 2:13-17 to 2:1-12

2:13-17 continues the thematic concern of 2:1-12 with sin.[92] In 2:1-12, the subject was forgiveness of sins; here the subject is calling/eating with sinners. Ἁμαρτίαι was used four times in the healing of the paralytic (2:5,7,9,10); ἁμαρτωλοί is used four times in this pericope (2:15, 16 bis, 17).[93] The two pericopes are presented in a logical order: first, Jesus demonstrates his power over sin and only then does he associate with sinners.[94] The relationship between the two pericopes is also ironic: in the first, Jesus is accused of blasphemy when he heals by forgiving sins; in the second, Jesus, in defense of his association with sinners, in effect claims to be like a doctor whose business is to be about the healing of the sick.

There are also major differences between the two pericopes. The first is a healing controversy; the second contains no miracles. The two stories involve a different cast of characters: in the first, the paralytic, the crowd, Jesus, and the opponents; in the second, the tax collectors and sinners (Levi), the disciples, Jesus, and the opponents. The disciples are not mentioned in the healing of the paralytic and they play a major role in the second controversy.

---

[92] Besides those who recognize a circular pattern in 2:1-3:6, many have noticed the continuation of theme between 2:1-12 and 13-17. See Sundwall, Zusammensetzung, p. 16; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 49; Minette de Tillesse, Secret, p. 122; Lane, Mark, p. 106.

[93] P. Mourlon Beernaert, "Jésus controversé: Structure et théologie de Marc 2,1-3,6," NRT 95 (1973) 143. Sundwall (Zusammensetzung, p. 16) also notes the use of sin and sinners as catchwords connecting the two pericopes.

[94] Lane (Mark, pp. 106-107) writes "the basis of table-fellowship was messianic forgiveness." See also Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl," p. 87.

The opposition is also presented differently in the two pericopes. In 2:1-12, the opponents were "some of the scribes;" in 2:13-17, the opponents are designated more formally as "the scribes of the Pharisees." In the first, the opponents mumbled in their hearts; in the second story, they openly ask the disciples about Jesus′ behavior. Opposition is more overt.

On the other hand, the accusation is much less serious. In the first controversy, the charge is blasphemy, which can lead to death (see 14:64). In the issue of eating, Jesus is breaking the Pharisaic tradition but not the Torah; he is certainly not liable to a death penalty.[95] And the atmosphere is much more friendly than in 2:6-10a. The question of the opponents assumes that Jesus himself is not a sinner or tax-collector. And Jesus′ answer in v. 17, even if it does not really answer the question, is positively irenic.[96] Within the story level, the scribes of the Pharisees are naturally assumed to be among "the well" and "the righteous;" even if Mark′s later

---

[95] Cf. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 102-103. Perrin thinks that, historically speaking, it was Jesus′ reinclusion of sinners in the community in table-fellowship which led to Jesus′ actual death. He sees the minor role of table-fellowship in the gospel tradition as "an indication of how far removed from historical reminiscence of the ministry of Jesus that tradition is, in its present form." (Ibid., p. 102.)

[96] The word is Bowman′s (Mark, p. 115).

Christian readers standing outside the story might consider these designations ironic.[97] Thus 2:13-17 continues the theme of Jesus' dealing with sin from 2:1-12, and picks up the element of opposition from 2:6-10a. The conflict is not as serious, but it is overt rather than held to one side by means of the interposition technique. And it now involves the disciples as well as Jesus.[98]

Exegetical Notes

The implications that rhetorical analysis has for exegesis have been discussed during the course of the rhetorical analysis itself (e.g., v. 15, the role of the disciples). Here I shall only point out two implications that the rhetorical analysis may have for the tradition history of the pericope.

Verse 14. Contrary to most scholarly opinion,[99] v. 14 may well be a redactional composition designed to fit a combination discipleship/ eating controversy. Verse 14 does not seem viable as an independent piece of tradition.[100] As noted in the analysis, the story of the call is about as simplified as it can be, and is constructed according to the model of 1:16-20, using much of the same vocabulary. It is uncertain that the verse by itself, without either 1:16-20 or 2:15-17, would be understood as a call to discipleship. The purpose of "following" is not given within the verse.

---

[97] There has been considerable debate in the literature on how "the righteous" should be understood. For differing opinions, see Lamarche, "Call," pp. 311-312; Taylor, Mark, p. 207; Bowman, Mark, p.115; Lane, Mark, pp. 104-105; Carlston, Parables, pp. 113-114. Most of the differences evaporate if one distinguishes the understanding of internal story level audience from that of Mark's audience.

[98] Budesheim, "Jesus," pp. 202-203.

[99] See above, p. 142, fn.61.To my knowledge, the only scholar to argue that vs. 14 is redactional is Pesch ("Levi-Matthäus," pp. 43-45). Pesch, arguing from a redactional and traditional history perspective has reached the same conclusion that I reach on the basis of a rhetorical analysis. The criterion of multiple methodologies suggests we may be correct.

Further, τελώνιον is needed for the narrative and rhetorical structure of vv. 15-17. Τελώνιον has been considered the catchword that led to the connection of v. 14 with vv. (15)16-17.[101] If this were the case and v. 14 had an independent existence, then one would expect more originality--new information or descriptive details--in v. 14. As it is, only the name, "Levi, son of Alphaeus," is added information--that is, not derived from the model in 1:16-20 nor needed for the following story. And the name "Levi" for a disciple is suspect. For Levi is not listed as one of the twelve in the gospel lists, and the tribe of Levi was not counted among the twelve tribes of Israel.[102]

---

[100] Dibelius' (Tradition, p. 64, fn. 1) suggestion that vv. 14 and 17 were the original paradigm is a more plausible hypothesis for a premarkan tradition, if any. Verse 14 would then be an "ideal" scene made to fit the sayings in v. 17.

[101] Sundwall, Zusammensetzung, p. 15.

The occurence of the disciples in v. 16. It is questionable if the disciples should be considered an integral part of the eating controversy in vv. 16-17a(b). They appear on the scene in order to receive the opponents' question. However, Jesus apparently responds directly to the opponents, in normal controversy fashion. In terms of the apophthegm form, the disciples do not fit well. They are an extra and non-essential character--the story already has three, the scribes of the Pharisees, the tax collectors and sinners, and Jesus. Indeed, it seems unlikely that the scribes of the story would distinguish, for example, between Levi the tax collector and Levi the disciple.[103]

On the other hand, the disciples fit well into the rhetorical structure of the whole of vv. 14-17 (see above). Thus the disciples seem to be a secondary addition to v. 16, most likely at the point vv. (13)14-17 were constructed as a unit, to emphasize the disciples' association with Jesus. It would appear that Bultmann is wrong in viewing the presence of the disciples in v. 16 as evidence that the controversy apophthegm necessarily originated in the life of the church, in defense of the church's behavior.[104] For whenever the eating controversy apophthegm may have originated, it appears to have existed before the disciples were added to it.

---

[102] Johnson, Mark, p. 61. Pesch ("Zöllnergastmahl," p. 71) argues that Mark transferred the phrase, "Levi, son of Alphaeus" from its traditional setting in v. 15.

[103] That is, in tradition history terms, those defending their own behavior in being or associating with sinners/Gentiles would hardly miss the point that their opponents viewed them as sinners, not as good Jews/ disciples. But cf. Daube, "Responsibilities of Master and Disciples in the Gospels," NTS 19 (1972-73) 1-15.

Mark 2:18-22:
The Question About Fasting

The question about fasting is a controversy apophthegm of the usual action-objection-vindication type. Verse 18 presents the exposition and the question about the disciples' behavior, while vv. 19-22 present Jesus' answer. In terms of controversy form, v. 19a completes the form, giving Jesus' pithy answer to the question raised. Jesus' answer, however, does not end here. The content of v. 19a is rephrased in 19b, and reversed in v. 20. Two additional sayings unconnected with fasting are added in vv. 21-22.[105]

The fasting apophthegm differs from the two earlier controversies in the Galilean controversy section in its lack of specificity. The pericope opens without a notation of Jesus' setting such as a house in Capernaum or beside the lake. The reader is not told where the story happens. Second, the question to Jesus is not connected to any specific event such as Jesus' address to a paralytic, or a meal at Levi's house. Rather, the question (and answer) deal with the pious practice of fasting in general and not with Jesus' or the disciples' violation of a specific fast.[106] Lastly, there are no specific named opponents, some scribes, or the Pharisees. The verbs ἔρχονται and λέγουσιν in v. 18 appear to be impersonal plurals, meaning in effect, "Jesus was asked."[107] Thus, while the pericope retains the controversy form, conflict is virtually absent from it, when it is considered in isolation from its context in the Galilean controversy section.

---

[104] History, p. 49. So also Hultgren, "Adversaries," p. 215.

[105] Many form critics view the "original" apophthegm as vv. 18-19a, with 19b-20 and 21-22 as separate additions. See Bultmann, History, p. 19; Hultgren, "Adversaries," pp. 155-159, and the literature cited there. Dibelius (Tradition, pp. 65-66) and Taylor (Mark, pp. 208, 211-212), on the other hand, argue that the controversy apophthegm consisted of vv. 18-20. Joachim Jeremias (Jesus als Weltvollender [BFCT 33:4; Gütersloh: G. Mohr, 1930], pp. 21-32) argues that all of vv. 18-22 were a unity.

Mark 2:18-22 also presents a different rhetorical structure from the first two controversies. There is no symmetrical rhythm at all. Rhetorically, the narrative falls into two approximately equal parts consisting of the controversy over fasting in vv. 18-20; and the two sayings on the old and new in vv. 21-22. Each part is again subdivided in half: in vv. 18-20, the exposition and question (v. 18) is balanced by Jesus' answer (vv. 19-20); in vv. 21-22, the two sayings balance each other. Here the pattern may be described as a a' + b b'.

As in the first two pericopes studied, word repetition is used extensively to structure the content and to indicate emphasis. The shift in content from the issue of fasting in vv. 18-20 to the relation of the old and the new in vv. 21-22 suggests that a major division in the pericope should be made between v. 20 and v. 21. The patterns of word repetition confirm this division: extensive use is made of repetition _within_ each half of the pericope, and virtually no use of repetition or other rhetorical devices is found _connecting_ the two halves of the pericope. First, vv. 18-20 will be discussed, then vv. 21-22, and finally, the relationship of the two parts. When the rhetorical analysis appears to have particular significance for exegetical or redactional issues, it will be mentioned in the text or footnotes; there will be no separate "exegetical notes" section.

---

[106] See Mt 11:18/Lk 7:33.

[107] C.H. Turner,"Marcan Usage," JTS 25 (1924) 378-379.

Verses 18-20

As already noted, vv. 18-20 are divided into two parallel pairs: a, v. 18, the exposition and question about fasting; a′, vv. 19-20, Jesus′ answer on fasting. This may easily be seen by looking at the use of the key word "to fast." In a, the reader is first told that the disciples of John and the Pharisees _fast_. The information is given again in the question, "why do the disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees _fast_?" Finally, at the end of the question, the contrast with the behavior of the disciples is made: "but your disciples do _not fast_?" Jesus′ answer in a′ shows a similar pattern. First, Jesus asks, "how can the sons of the bridechamber _fast_?" Then he reiterates the information as a statement, "they cannot _fast_." Finally he notes the situation will change, "a time will come when they _do fast_."

Thus, the verb "to fast" is repeated three times each in a and in a′. In each case, the pattern of the content is repetition, then reversal: in a, fast, fast; not fast; in a′, not fast, not fast; fast. In neither instance is the repetition necessary for understanding the narrative.[108] The repetition may serve the rhetorical function of underlining the first position stated, so that the contrast, when it is made, is highlighted. A closer analysis of the rhetorical pattern of repetition in v. 18 and vv. 19-20 confirms the emphasis upon contrast.

Verse 18 (a).

Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες.
καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ,
Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν,
οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

The placing of the verb "to fast" in all three instances at the end of its clause places the rhetorical emphasis of the pericope on the issue of fasting. The repetition of οἱ μαθηταί four times within such a short space also stresses the importance of "disciples" in the story.[109] The word order of the first three uses is the customary one--noun followed by its genitive (of John, of the Pharisees). In the final use, in regard to Jesus′ disciples, the word order is reversed. The more emphatic σοι is used insetad of the usual genitive σου, and it is placed before, rather than after, the noun, "disciples."[110] A shift in word order for emphasis is a common rhetorical technique of both oral and written literature.[111] The use of repetition and the word order shift in v. 18 serves to focus the hearer's attention on the contrast between Jesus' disciples and others in regard to fasting.[112] As the preceding pericope distinguished Jesus' disciples from tax collectors and sinners, and from the scribes of the Pharisees, so here they are distinguished from the disciples of John and the Pharisees.

---

[108] Matthew and Luke omit the repetition in both a and a′ (see Mt 9:14-15; Lk 5:33-35).

[109] The rhetorical function of underlining "disciple" may possibly be the explanation for the strange phrase, "the disciples of the Pharisees."

Verses 19-20 (a')

Jesus' answer presents a similar use of repetition and word order change:

Μὴ δύναται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν νηστεύειν;
ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν οὐ δύναται νηστεύειν·

---

[110] This is the only instance in Mark where the modifier precedes "disciples," and the only time the dative is used. Luke keeps the dative but drops the noun, writing, οἱ δὲ σοὶ... (Lk 5:33). Matthew employs the more usual construction, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σου (Mt 9:14).

[111] A similar shift in word order may be found in Mk 3:31-35 (mother... brothers, three times, then brothers...mother) and in 9:42-47 (καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ/σε three times, followed by καλόν σέ ἐστιν). Perhaps the four mentions of Jesus' silence in the trial narratives should also be included here: οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν (14:60), οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν (14:61), οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν (15:4), and finally οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη (15:5).

[112] It is possible that the desire to stress the contrast between groups of disciples is responsible for the lack of specific opponents in the story. For then the opposition between Jesus and the opponents would add a second dimension to the story and dilute what is now the primary contrast.

ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος,
καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

The heavy emphasis on νηστεύω found in a, is continued in a′. Twice more, a clause ends with the verb, "to fast." Five times, in vv. 18 and 19, the reader has heard a major clause end with some form of νηστεύω. Three times the hearers have been told Jesus′ followers do not fast (v. 18, v. 19 bis). Finally, in v. 20, the sixth and last use of the word is placed before the end of the clause. And here, the reader is told that the disciples will fast. The shift in word order and the coincident shift in content mark v. 20 as the climax of vv. 18-20.[113]

As "disciples" was employed four times in a, so the metaphor of the bridegroom′s attendants is used four times in a′.[114] First, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος are mentioned; then, twice, the phrase, "those with the bridegroom," (in the order νυμφίος/ον μετ᾽ αὐτῶν), are mentioned (v. 19). Last, in v. 20, the bridegroom is taken away from them (ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος). Again, in the final instance of repetition (also a contrast), the word order is shifted. The technique of word order shift in a final repetition is used in v. 18 with "disciples," in vv. 19-20; with "those with the bridegroom;" and in the larger unit, vv.

---

[113] A final shift in word order appears to indicate climax, but not necessarily contrast. See the examples given above, pp. Whether or not contrast is also present depends on the content.

[114] The desire for balance between a and a′ may also help to explain the phrase, "the disciples of the Pharisees" in a.

18-20, with "to fast."

Thus, Jesus' answer in a' neatly balances the exposition and question of a in the use of the word "to fast" and in the parallelism of the sons of the bridechamber with disciples. Jesus' answer, however, not only balances a, but itself falls into two balanced parts, v. 19 and v. 20.[115] Verse 19 explicitly answers the question posed in a, why Jesus' disciples do not fast; v. 20 moves beyond v. 19 to posit a time when the disciples will fast. Verse 19 is delimited by the use of μὴ δύναται/οὐ δύναται at the beginning and near the end (just preceding νηστεύειν)-- the technique of inclusio. Verse 20 is delimited by ἡμέραι/ἡμέρᾳ near the beginning and at the end, again an inclusio.[116] Verse 19, describing the time when the bridegroom is with the disciples, is thus clearly separated from v. 20, the time after the bridegroom is taken away.[117]

---

[115] Albertz (Streitgespräche, pp. 8-9) has called attention to the fact that the sayings in vv. 19-20 each fall into four half lines, with intricate chiastic, antithetical, and linear relationships. He believes this is due to the rhythm of the semitic Vorlage.

[116] The rhetorical analysis has not helped to clarify whether "that day" refers specifically to the day of crucifixion or in general to the time after Jesus' death. For scholars' opinions, see Kuhn, Sammlungen, pp. 61-72; Weeden, Mark, pp. 133-135; Carlston, Parables, p. 120, fn. 17.

[117] T.A. Burkill (New Light on the Earliest Gospel: Seven Markan Studies [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972] p. 46) notes that the same idea of the Christ absent from the community is also to be found in Mk14:7 in regard to alms giving.

Summary

Verse 18, (a), contrasts the fasting practices of groups of people at one period of time; vv. 19-20, (a′), contrasts the fasting practice of the group named last in a, Jesus′ disciples, at two points in time. Verses 19-20 not only answer the question raised in a, but also move beyond it to envision a new situation.

The rhetorical unity and balance of vv. 18-20, the fasting controversy proper, is most impressive. Whatever the tradition history of Jesus′ answer covering the two periods of time before and after his death may have been, the stages of its development are not visible in the text found in Mark. The allegorical allusion to Jesus′ death in v. 20 is not just tacked on to the preceding material.[118] Rather, Jesus′ answer in its entirety (vv. 19-20) closely parallels the statement of the issue in v. 18. The tradition history of these verses cannot be detected on the basis of literary joins.

Verses 21-22

The verses consist of two sayings parallel in form, οὐδεὶς..., εἰ δὲ μή..., and similar in content, the incompatibility or discontinuity of the new and the old. The verses are connected rhetorically by the hook words, παλαιός and especially, καινός. Without the hook phrases employing καινός, the verses are almost exactly parallel in structure and content:

---

[118] The pronouncement story parallel in the Gospel of Thomas (logion 104) also treats the material of vv. 18-20 as a unity, delimited by a chiastic inclusio: pray and fast: fast and pray.

21a οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν·
b εἰ δὲ μή, αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ...
c καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται.

22a καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς
b εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς
c καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί...

(The above schema is an artificial construct used to explicate the rhetorical features of the verses. It does not necessarily posit that the verses ever existed in that form.) In each verse, line a states that nobody puts something unshrunk/new into something old; line b states what will happen if someone does, namely that the new element will disrupt the old; and line c gives the final result--a worse tear is made, the wine and the wineskins are lost.

The point seems to be stronger than that the old and new do not mix; rather the new is an active threat to the continued existence of the old, and may itself be harmed in the destruction of the old. As Bacon wrote many years ago:

> The section concludes with two proverbs of unknown derivation whose application is a radical one. The new order cannot be treated as a patching up of the old (verse 21). The attempt to impose constraint on new forces will bring explosion (verse 22).[119]

The hook phrases employing καινός show that, given the danger of the new to the old, the new is to be established, not the old preserved.

---

[119] The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925), p.157. So also Johnson, Mark, p. 66; Lane, Mark, p. 113.

The interposition of τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ between v. 21b and c is parenthetical, making explicit the new/old opposition.[120] The final clause, ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, at the end of v. 22, is in antithetic parallelism to 22a:[121]

a καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς--
b εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς
c καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί--
d ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.

Line a repeats παλαιός from the interposition in v. 21; line d repeats καινός from it. Βάλλει serves as the verb for both lines a and d (an instance of prozeugma). The sense of d then is: "Rather, [put] new wine into new wineskins!"

Verses 18-22 as a whole

If the rhetorical structure and meaning of vv. 18-20 and 21-22 are each quite clear, the connection of the two parts of the pericope is not. The rhetorical links between the parts are minimal. First, the verses are an uninterrupted continuation of Jesus' sayings on fasting. There is no indication of a new beginning such as καὶ λέγει/

---

[120] Also, retrospectively, it facilitates the application of the conclusion in v. 22d to v. 21 as well as v. 22.

[121] So Taylor (Mark, p. 214), following C.H. Turner ("Marcan Usage," JTS 26 [1925] 147) who describes lines b and c as a typical markan parenthesis. This is the preferred reading (with a rating of C) of the United Bible Society's Greek New Testament.

ἔλεγεν.[122] Secondly, vv. 21-22 as a whole follow a rhetorical pattern similar to that found in a and a′ of vv. 18-20, the pattern of restatement followed by contrast or reversal. Verse 22d, employing the strong adversative particle ἀλλὰ contrasts the establishment of the new with the concern for the old shown in vv. 21-22c.

Both the continuation of direct discourse and the similarity of rhetorical structure suggest that some logical connection is intended between vv. 18-20 and 21-22. The facts that vv. 18 (a) and 19-20 (a′) present such a tight rhetorical unity, and that vv. 21-22 follow a similar pattern to a or a′ , make it extremely doubtful that the view held by Bultmann and others that vv. 21-22 are meant to be understood in light of vv. 18-19, excluding vv. 20 is correct.[123] Such an interpretation runs counter to the rhetorical structure in which the entirety of a′ (vv. 19-20) parallels a (v. 18).

More probable is the suggestion that vv. 21-22 are a second answer to the question posed in v. 18.[124] The rhetorical pattern might be described as a, a′, a′′. The logic would be not unlike that found in Mark 12:18-27 where Jesus first answers the specific issue about the woman′s husbands, and then deals with the general question of resurrection. Here Jesus answers the specific question about fasting, and then speaks about the fundamental change made by the coming of the kingdom or the new age--of which not fasting is one consequence. The difficulty here is that vv. 18-20 are a tight rhetorical unity, while vv. 21-22 are only loosely attached. This solution, however, appears to have the most rhetorical support.

---

[122] Luke inserts ἔλεγεν (5:36). In the markan text, there is not even a connecting participle.

[123] Bultmann, History, p. 19.

[124] This view is held by Lane, Mark, p. 113; J.B. Muddiman, "Jesus and Fasting," in Jésus aux origines de la christologie, (ed. J. Dupont, BETL 40; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1975) p. 275.

A third possibility for the relationship of vv. 21-22 to vv. 18-20 would be to see vv. 21-22 as a continuation in time after the death of the bridegroom.[125] Given the abundant references to time in vv. 19-20, and the dearth of them in vv. 21-22, this view does not appear to be grounded in the text. Viewing the individual pericope in isolation, it may be said that the rhetorical approach has been more successful in pointing out difficulties with proposed solutions to the question of the logical relationship of vv. 21-22 to 18-20, than in propounding a solution of its own.

Mark 2:23-28: Plucking Grain on the Sabbath

The controversy over plucking grain, like the two preceding pericopes, is a controversy apophthegm of the action-objection-vindication type. As in the preceding two stories, the narrative is developed beyond the basic requirements of the controversy form. In this instance, the exposition and question are followed by two formally separate answers by Jesus.[126] Jesus and the disciples are walking through fields on the sabbath, and the disciples are plucking grain. The opponents ask Jesus why the disciples are breaking the sabbath law. Jesus first replies with the example of David who ate the bread of the presence and gave it to his followers; and then replies that the sabbath was made for man, so that the Son of man is lord of the sabbath. The relationship of the two answers to each other and to the question has been and remains a problem for exegetes.[127]

---

[125] So Mourlon Beernaert, "Jésus controversé," pp. 144-145.

Here, rhetorical analysis will be applied, to see what light it may shed on the interrelationships of the parts of the text. The order of presenting the analysis will differ from that employed in discussing the three earlier pericopes. First, the indications of overall rhetorical structure will be described, and then the individual parts will be discussed. Finally, there will be a short discussion of of the title, Son of man, in 2:28.

---

[126] Introduced by καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς and καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς respectively (vv. 25,27). The phenomenon of two formally distinct answers addressed to the same audience is only found here and in Mk 7:1-13 in the apophthegmatic material in Mark.

[127] The question has been addressed mainly in terms of which answer, vv. 25-26, or (some or all of) vv. 27-28, was the original ending of the controversy apophthegm. The general opinion has been that vv. 25-26 constitute the original answer. (So Albertz, *Streitgespräche*, p. 10; Bultmann, *History*, pp. 16-17; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 218, etc.) Erich Klostermann (*Das Markusevangelium*, 4th ed. [HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950] p. 29) in his 1926 edition was apparently the first to suggest that vv. 25-26 were the later addition. Since then, Haenchen (*Weg*, p. 121), Kuhn (*Sammlungen*, pp. 74-77); Hultgren ("The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mark 2:23-28," *JBL* 91 [1972] 38-43) among others have argued for this position. For an excellent and exhautive survey of scholarly opinion, see Neirynck, "Jesus and the Sabbath: Some Observations on Mark II:27," *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (ed. J. Dupont; BETL 40; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1975), pp. 227-270.

Indications of the Overall Rhetorical Structure

On the basis of content, the pericope consists of three parts: the exposition and question (vv. 23-24), Jesus′ first answer (vv. 25-26), and Jesus′ second answer (vv. 27-28). An analysis of the use of word repetition in the text confirms the division based on content. The use of word repetition is much less extensive in this pericope than in the three pericopes already analyzed. There is some employment of word repetition within each of the three parts of the text. The phrase τοῖς σάββασιν occurs twice in vv. 23-24. The repetitions ἔφαγεν/φαγεῖν and οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ/τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ occur in vv. 25-26. The words "sabbath" and "man" are used three times each in vv. 27-28.

Hook word repetition is also used to connect the three parts of pericope. The opponents′ question in v. 24 reads as follows:

Ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;

Jesus answers the opponents: Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυίδ; (v. 25). He ate the bread of the presence which it was not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) for anyone but priests to eat (v. 26). The first answer is connected to the question in that in both someone disobeys the law. In the answer, however, David himself disobeys the law, while in the opening scene sparking the controversy Jesus does not. Further, it is not clear how David′s disobedience in eating justifies the breaking of the sabbath.

Jesus′ second answer picks up the remaining word from the opponents' question, "sabbath," and asserts the Son of man's lordship over the sabbath. The second answer is not connected to the first answer in content or by means of word repetition. It appears to refer directly back to the question in v. 24. Here also, the relation of the answer to the question is not clear: how does the lordship of the Son of man justify the disciples' disobedience?

Thus the basic rhetorical structure of 2:23-28 is quite clear.[128] The text has a tripartite division in which the second and third parts are each joined to the first by means of hook words. The last part, vv. 27-28, does not continue the thought of the middle part, but rather answers directly the question raised in the first part. Thus the passage has a circular rhythm, the end recalling the opening. The repetition of the word "sabbath" in both the first and last parts emphasizes the connection, and the importance of the sabbath issue. Recognition of the rhetorical structure, however, still leaves many questions unanswered about the logical progress of the argument in the pericope. A closer consideration of the individual parts of the structure is in order.

---

[128] In 1864, H.A.W. Meyer (Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas [Göttingen: 1864] p. 37; cited in Neirynck, "Sabbath," p. 259) argued that Jesus first answered the issue of illegality, and then the issue of the Sabbath, thus implicitly recognizing the rhetorical links of the pericope. Meyer, however, argued that the making of a path was in itself illegal, and the Sabbath only an aggravating circumstance. The fact that gleaning was permissible (Lev 19:9; 23:22), and the emphasis on the sabbath within the pericope would appear to make Meyer's position untenable.

Analysis of the Individual Elements

Verses 23-24. The exposition and question presented in these verses conform more closely to the typical or "ideal" controversy form than those found in the earlier pericopes. The exposition is brief, describing a specific incident; specific opponents question Jesus. In the course of walking through a field on the sabbath, the disciples pluck grain, that is, violate the laws forbidding work on the sabbath. The normal translation of the Greek of v. 23b is "the disciples began to make a path (or make way), plucking the grain."[129] The reason for the plucking of the grain, insofar as it is indicated in the text, would appear to be to make a path for Jesus.[130]

In v. 24, the Pharisees, who are conveniently upon the scene in 2:16, ask Jesus why the disciples are acting unlawfully on the sabbath. As in the preceding controversy over fasting, Jesus is questioned about the disciples' behavior. The sabbath violation raises a more serious issue, however, than not fasting. Fasting was a matter of customary piety;[131] working on the sabbath was a violation of the written law. The question of the opponents reflects the seriousness: "Look, why are they doing something illegal...." On the story level, the Pharisees are holding Jesus responsible for the illegal behavior of his disciples, even though Jesus himself is not breaking the law.[132]

---

[129] Grammatically, one would expect ἤρξαντο to be constructed with the infinitive phrase, ὁδὸν ποιεῖν, not with the participle τίλλοντες as the RSV and many commentators read the text. Ἄρχομαι plus an infinitive is more normal Greek; further the other twenty-five uses of ἄρχομαι in Mark are all followed by infinitives. There seems no reason to make an exception for 2:23. Scholars who read ἤρξαντο with ὁδὸν ποιεῖν include Hawkins (*Horae*, p. 122); Bacon (*Beginnings*, pp. 30-31); and most recently, É. Delebecque, ("Les épis 'égrenés' dans les Synoptiques," *Revue des Études Grecques* 88 [1975] 133-142).

[130] Albert Henrichs writes, "For Mark, the plucking of the grain is not a means of providing food but of clearing the way for Jesus" (personal communication).

Verses 25-26. In his first answer, Jesus adduces the example of David eating the showbread. The hook words τί ἐποίησεν and οὐκ ἔξεστιν indicate that the connection between the situation and Jesus' answer is that the disciples and David both engage in illegal activity. Using David as an example shows that breaking the law is sometimes justified. The law that is broken, however, differs. The disciples violate the sabbath, while David's act is not a violation of the sabbath rest.[133] The text stresses that David's illegal act is that of eating: David ate the showbread which was not lawful for him to eat (v. 26). The example of David's illegal eating would appear to be a good answer to the question in 2:16 about Jesus' eating behavior. It does not, however, appear to relate to the disciples' action in v. 23. The plucking of grain is not presented as a step in the gathering and preparation of food; nor is the reader told that Jesus or the disciples were in any need or hungry.[134] The relevance of Jesus' answer to the question does not have to do with eating.[135]

---

[131] Except for the Day of Atonement, which does not appear to be in question in 2:18-20.

[132] Daube, "Responsibilities," p. 5.

[133] The rabbinic tradition sometimes supposes that the David incident occurred on a sabbath. See Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. 1; pp. 618-619; B. Murmelstein, "Jesus Gang durch die Saatfelder," Angelos 3 (1930) 111-120. The connection with the sabbath, however, is not made either in 1 Samuel or in the synoptic tradition.

A clue to the relevance of the answer may be seen in the treatment of David's followers in vv. 25-26.[136] The verses stress the primacy of David and the secondary and dependent role of his companions. First, the reader is told that David is in need and hungry, then αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ. First, David eats the showbread, then he gives it also (even?) to τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν. David's followers also act illegally, but only because they are with David, and because David has authorized them to do so. Jesus' answer may convey to the reader that the disciples acted illegally on the sabbath because they are associated with Jesus, and Jesus has authorized their action. Then, vv. 25-26 would seem to function in their immediate context, first, as a statement that illegal behavior is sometimes appropriate, and second, as an indication that the disciples' behavior is dependent on their relationship to Jesus. The emphasis upon eating in vv. 25-26, as will be argued below, is significant not in the context of this pericope but in the structure of 2:1-3:6 as a whole.[137]

---

[134] Both Matthew (Mt 12:1) and Luke (Lk 6:1) modify the exposition so that the disciples eat the grain. In Mark, the disciples do not.

[135] Most scholars, following Matthew and Luke, make the connection between question and answer on the basis of eating. So, for example, Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 64; Farrer, Mark, p. 72; Taylor, Mark, p. 215. In order to make such a connection, it is necessary to force the meaning of v. 23b. For example, Taylor writes, "From the sequel, however, it appears that the disciples' offense is not that of working or of exceeding limits of a Sabbath day's journey, but of gathering and eating food on the Sabbath. Mark, therefore, must mean that the disciples 'began as they went, to pluck'" (Mark, p. 215). On the translation of v. 23b, see above, p. 174.

[136] In the story in 1 Sam 21:1-6, David does not have any companions. For a suggested tradition-history development of this addition, see Daube, "Responsibilities," pp. 5-7.

Verses 27-28. Jesus' second answer in vv. 27-28 consists of two sayings, first the general proverb, "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath" (v. 27) followed by the christological saying, "Therefore, the Son of man is lord of the sabbath" (v. 28). From the rhetorical perspective, the two sayings are interrelated and function as a single answer to the opponents.[138] They are connected by the conjunction ὥστε, by the repeated use of the words "sabbath" and "man," and by the play on words between "man" in v. 27 and "Son of man" in v. 28.[139]

Jesus' second answer does not build upon the first answer in vv. 25-26. The new introduction, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, indicates the break in the argument. The phrase is a literary device by which "Mark [or an earlier editor] indicated that the statement which follows has no direct relationship to the immediately preceding verses."[140] The answer, however, is connected with the exposition-question in vv. 23-24 by the use of the hook word "sabbath" and by the fact that it does present a justification for ignoring the sabbath law. The saying in v. 27 most probably refers to God's purpose in creating man and the sabbath.[141] If so, the logic is similar to Mark 10:2-9 in which Jesus appeals to God's intention at creation to override a mosaic law.[142] The saying in v. 28 asserts Jesus' sovereignty over the sabbath law. The answer as such does not directly justify the *disciples'* illegal behavior in v. 23. However, the intervening answer about David's eating the showbread has stressed that the followers' behavior depends upon the master. If Jesus' authority over the sabbath is accepted, then the disciples' behavior is justified.

---

[137] See below, pp. 202-204.

[138] Scholars have spent much time and energy trying to determine the tradition history of these two sayings, without reaching any consensus. See Neirynck, "Sabbath," pp. 237-254.

[139] See Elliott, "Man and the Son of Man," pp. 50-58.

---

[140] Lane, *Mark*, p. 118. Many have argued that the use of καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in v. 27 is a markan seam showing that Mark has added vv. 27-28 to the original apophthegm (Bultmann, *History*, pp. 16,323); Marxsen, *Introduction*, p. 122; Neirynck, "Sabbath," p. 264). Kuhn (*Sammlungen*, p. 74), on the other hand, considers the phrase as Mark's transition from his interpolation of vv. 25-26 to the original conclusion of the apophthegm in v. 27. It would seem that either (or neither) explanation may be correct. One can deduce from the phrase that there is a break in the narrative; one cannot deduce the historical development of the pericope.

[141] So Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 65; Robinson, *History*, p. 47; Haenchen, *Weg*, p. 120, fn. 3; Lane, *Mark*, p. 119. Cf. Nineham (*Mark*, p. 106) who sees v. 27 making explicit the principle which underlies vv. 25-26--special need overrides the law. The saying in v. 27, however, does not appear to speak to the question of need vs. law.

[142] Lane, *Mark*, p. 118.

Summary. The pericope then has a narrative logic. While the full significance of vv. 25-26 can only be understood in the larger context of 2:1-3:6, the verses function in their immediate context to stress the derivative role of the disciple or follower,and to prepare the way for an answer to the original question in terms of Jesus′ authority. In narrative terms, Jesus accepts responsibility for his disciples′ behavior, and challenges his opponents that if they wish to take issue on the matter, they must reckon with him, not merely with his disciples.

The lines of conflict are more sharply drawn in 2:23-28 than in any of the controversies since the question of blasphemy in 2:6-10a. On the one hand, the Pharisees assert the validigy of the sabbath law; on the other, Jesus claims that, as Son of man, he is lord of the sabbath. As in the controversy over forgiveness/blasphemy, so here the two positions are irreconcilable. This time, the disciples also are involved in the conflict, since it is they who break the sabbath law, and whom Jesus defends by his claim over the sabbath.

The Use of "Son of man" in 2:28

The use of the title, Son of man, in 2:28 recalls to the reader the earlier use of the title in 2:10. Καί in 2:28 would appear to mean "also" and to refer the reader explicitly to 2:10.[143] The rhetorical structure of the two sayings is similar:

2:10 ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἀμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
2:28 κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου

---

[143] Kuhn, Sammlungen, pp. 73, 76, 87. Kuhn′s argument is that the Son of man sayings frame the premarkan collection as he finds in 2:1-28. Within the markan context as well, the second use of "Son of man" would remind the reader of the first.

In each saying, the claim of authority (ἐξουσία, κύριος) is placed first, followed by the verb, the subject, and at the end, the object of the authority--forgiving sins on earth, the sabbath. The reader is held in suspense until the end of the saying. In each instance, the object of the authority introduces an element of surprise. From our knowledge of the Son of man figure from Daniel and Enoch, one would not expect the figure to have authority on earth or over the sabbath.

The saying in 2:28 not only recalls 2:10 to the reader's mind; it also builds upon information given to the reader in 2:10. The identification of Jesus and the Son of man was made in v. 10;[144] the identification is taken for granted in 2:28. Furthermore, the logic of vv. 27-28 assumes that the reader already knows that the Son of man has authority on earth. The fact that God's purpose in creating the sabbath was for man, does not of itself imply that the Son of man is lord over the sabbath. However, if the reader already knows that the Son of man has authority on earth, then the idea that the Son of man has authority to carry out God's intention in regard to the sabbath follows quite naturally. The reader/hearer who has heard v. 10 would not be surprised at the use of the conjunction ὥστε at the beginning of v. 28.[145]

---

[144] See above, p. 141.

[145] The dependence of v. 28 on v. 10 suggests that the Son of man saying in v. 28 was not added to v. 27 until the controversy over plucking grain was joined to the earlier controversies which included the Son of man saying in 2:10. This would be an additional argument against a premarkan collection of 2:15-3:5(6).

Verse 28 also points ahead to the following sabbath controversy. Lane has suggested that the question about the sabbath in v. 24 may be the legal warning necessary before actual prosecution on a charge can be made (M. Sanhedrin VII.8).[146] In v. 28, Jesus asserts his authority over the sabbath, an answer not acceptable under Jewish law. Then in 3:2, the opponents are watching Jesus, in order to accuse him legally if he violates the sabbath. Since Jesus has been warned in 2:24, if he acts illegally on the sabbath in 3:1-6, he is liable to arrest. Thus while rhetorically 2:28 is part of the unit, 2:23-28, and 3:1 presents a new narrative beginning, there is a logical connection between the two pericopes. The claim of Jesus in 2:28 prepares the reader for the higher level of hostility and the greater stakes involved in 3:1-6.

Mark 3:1-6
The Man with the Withered Hand

In content, the healing of the man with the withered hand is a continuation of the debate over sabbath observance begun in the story of the plucking of the grain. The hook words τοῖς σάββασιν (2,23,24; 3:4) and ἔξεστιν (2:24,26; 3:4) connect the two pericopes.[147] Further, 3:1-6 builds upon the narrative of 2:23-28. In 2:28, Jesus claims, as Son of man, to be lord of the sabbath. In 3:1-6, he demonstrates or illustrates his lordship by healing on the sabbath.[148] In addition, the fact that the antecedent of "they" of παρετήρουν (3:2) seems to be the Pharisaic group who questioned Jesus about the disciples' sabbath behavior in 2:24, indicates the continuity of the narrative.[149]

---

[146] Lane, Mark, p. 115. See also Neirynck, "Sabbath," p. 270, fn. 157.

[147] Sundwall (Zusammensetzung, p. 19) considers σάββατον and ἄνθρωπος hook words, but not ἔξεστιν. I would consider ἔξεστιν a hook word since it is used twice in connection with the sabbath (2:24; 3:4) and because its use in 3:4 is rather arbitrary--it is never lawful to do harm or kill. Since ἄνθρωπος is generic or part of a title in 2:27-28 and refers to a specific sick man in 3:1-5, it would not to be a hook word.

In form, however, the last controversy has much more in common with the healing of the paralytic, the first controversy in 2:1-12 than with 2:23-28. Like the healing of the paralytic, 3:1-6 is a healing controversy with the actual healing at the end. In 3:1-6 the characters are Jesus, the sick man and the opponents. In both 2:1-12 and 3:1-6, the opposition of the opponents is not voiced aloud.[150]

Perhaps the most striking similarity between 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 is the rhetorical pattern: the miracle is begun, then interrupted for Jesus' address to the opponents, and only after that completed.[151]

---

[148] Lane, Mark, p. 121; Geoltrain, "Violation," p. 76.

[149] So Bowman, Mark, p. 118; Budesheim, "Jesus," p. 204. In the narrative setting of 2:23-3:6, 3:6 confirms that "they" refers to the Pharisees. Cf. Turner ("Marcan Usage," JTS 25 [1924] 379), who considers παρετήρουν an impersonal plural functioning as a passive similar to ἔρχονται and λέγουσιν in 2:18. Given the structure of the sentence, κατηγορήσωσιν would then also be an impersonal plural. This seems improbable and Turner does not so consider it.

[150] Albertz, Streitgespräche, p. 6.

[151] Very few commentators have noticed the similarity in form between 2:1-12 and 3:1-6, perhaps because they share Bultmann's belief that 2:1-12 is a mixed miracle-apophthegm form and 3:1-6 is an

As the debate section in 2:1-12 is framed by Jesus' two addresses to the paralytic, here Jesus' answer to the opponents is framed by his two commands to the sick man, introduced by λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ (3:3,5). The three parts of the pericope will first be analyzed: 3:1-3, the beginning of the miracle; 3:4-5a, Jesus' interchange with his opponents; and 3:5b-6, the completion of the miracle. Then, the pericope as a whole will be discussed, in itself and as the conclusion to 2:1-3:6.

Rhetorical Analysis of the Individual Parts

Verses 1-3: Jesus once again enters a synagogue. The opening phrase echoes the opening phrase of the controversy section in 2:1: Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν (εἰσελθὼν) πάλιν εἰς. Πάλιν, as in 2:1 and 13, refers specifically to a place Jesus has already been in chapter one; in this case a synagogue 1:21).[152] The reader is informed that there is a sick man present--a man with a withered hand--and the opponents are watching Jesus to see if he will heal on the sabbath, in order to accuse him. The description of the opponents presumes, on the internal story level, that they are aware of Jesus' healing powers and the likelihood that he would heal on the sabbath.[153] Mark's readers

---

"organically complete apophthegm" (History, pp. 12, 14-15). The similarity has been recognized by Rudolf Grob (Einführung in das Markus Evangelium [Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1965], pp. 37-38); Budesheim, ("Jesus," p. 191); Kelber, (Kingdom, p. 21); Kolenkow, ("Healing Controversy," pp. 635-636); and Kee,, Community, pp. 35-37.

[152] This may perhaps indicate that the synagogue at Capernaum is meant.

[153] So Haenchen, Weg, p. 123; Budesheim, "Jesus," p. 204. Budesheim notes, "Just this expectance [of healing] devoid of the idea of hostiliy, has been called 'faith' in 2:5."

have been well prepared for these presuppositions by the narrative of the gospel thus far. Jesus' healings have played a prominent role (1:21-27, 29-31, 32-34, 39, 40-44; 2:1-12). Two have occurred on the sabbath: the public exorcism in the synagogue (the story recalled by πάλιν and the healing of Peter's mother-in-law.

Further, the description of the opponents emphasizes their hostility or opposition to Jesus. The opponents' "watching" is hardly neutral curiosity. They wish to accuse him, that is, bring legal charges against him.[154] Sabbath violation could be a serious charge, punishable by death (Exod 31:14-15; M. Sanhedrin 7:4).[155] The fact that the Pharisees are trying to find legal grounds for accusing Jesus shows that, on the story level, they do not accept Jesus' claim that, as Son of man, he is lord of the sabbath.[156] In their eyes, Jesus does not have the authority to change or ignore the sabbath law.

In v. 3, Jesus says to the handicapped man: ἔγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον, literally, "get up to the middle." Jesus has commanded the man to stand on center stage; whatever healing may occur will be witnessed by everyone present.[157] The public nature of the healing confronts not only the synagogue audience but also the reader with the choice between Jesus and the Pharisees. The reader may either accept that Jesus indeed has the authority to dispense the divinely ordained sabbath law, or he may agree with the Pharisees that the sabbath law is binding on Jesus.

---

[154] Friedrich Buschel, " Κατηγορέω," TDNT, Vol 3, p. 637.

[155] For rabbinc regulations on sabbath healing, see Eduard Lohse, "Jesu Worte über den Sabbat," Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias, (ed. Walther Eltester; BNZW 26; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), pp. 79-89; J. Louis Maryn, History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel (New York: Harper & Row, 1969).

[156] This suggests the issue in 3:1-6 may not be less serious than the issue of blasphemy in 2:1-2, as most scholars believe.

Verses 4-5a: As the narrative is recounted in Mark, vv. 4-5a are the central part of a ring composition, in which Jesus concerns himself with his opponents, between the outer ring which contains the miracle.[158] Although the reader is not told explicitly as he was in 2:8, Jesus appears to be aware of the unspoken objection of the Pharisees--violation of the sabbath.[159] For he responds with a double counter-question about what is legal on the sabbath: to do good or to do harm (evil), and to save life or to kill.[160]

---

[157] Johnson, Mark, p. 71.

[158] Strictly speaking, vv. 4-5a should not be considered an interposition. It is not sufficiently foreign or set off from the outer ring in which the opponents also feature strongly.

[159] This may be an indication of the interdependence of the narrative of 2:1-3:6. The reader already knows that Jesus can read the minds of his opponents.

[160] In his structuralist interpretation, Dan O. Via (Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament: A Structuralist Approach to Hermeneutic [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975], p. 132) defines the conflict as follows: "The tacit view of the Pharisees is that one must choose one of the members from the opposition to-do-on-the-sabbath/not-to-do-on-the-sabbath, while the view that Jesus is trying to establish is

Several features of the saying should be noted. In the first place, the saying does not directly address the issue of legality on the sabbath. It was not legal to do harm or kill on any day of the week; saving life was permitted on the sabbath even if it violated the sabbath rest. The Pharisees would consider Jesus' answer irrelevant to the issue of sabbath observance.[161]

Second, the saying admits no middle ground; there are no neutral acts. One must choose to do good _or_ evil, to save life _or_ kill. The parallelism between the two pairs of alternatives accentuates the seriousness of one's acts: doing good is in effect saving life; failing to do good may be equivalent to killing. Third, the saying in its narrative context is the assertion of a general principle which overrides the Mosaic law concerning the sabbath.[162] As a general principle, it becomes not only the principle by which Jesus acts, but also the principle by which the actions of Jesus' opponents will be judged and condemned.

---

that one must choose between the two alternatives to-do-good/to-do-evil." As far as he goes, Via is correct. He--or the structuralist method--however, ignores the fact that, for the Pharisees keeping the sabbath is doing good and vice versa, and that Jesus' counter-question is presented in the narrative as a justification for violation of the sabbath, not as an alternate principle (ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν, 3:4).

[161] Verse 4 would be more appropriate as a response to an attack on Jesus' general healing activity. This suggests that if 3:1-5 ever existed as an independent unit in the tradition, it may have lacked any reference to the sabbath.

[162] Siegfried Schulz ("Markus und das Alte Testament," _ZTK_ 58 [1961] 194), views Mk 3:4 as Mark's criterion for deciding what remains valid in the Old Testament and what is abrogated.

Last, unlike Jesus' answers in all four preceding apophthegms, here Jesus' response contains no direct personal claim. In this pericope, Jesus does not justify his (or the disciples') objectionable behavior on the basis of his own particular status or mission. By means of a rhetorical question, he asserts a universal principle applicable to all. In the gospel narrative, Jesus' assertion of a principle which can override the Law is undoubtedly an indirect claim to be speaking for God. Nonetheless, the saying places the opponents in the position of grappling with the issue of doing good, a goal they would accept, rather than being able to attack Jesus on the basis of a potentially blasphemous personal claim.

The opponents remain silent. Jesus then reacts to the opponents with anger and grief at their hardness of heart (v. 5a), one of the longest descriptions of Jesus' emotions to be found in the gospel. The biographical interest, not characteristic of the controversy apophthegm form, serves to intensify the element of conflict between the opponents and Jesus: not only do the opponents seek to accuse Jesus, but Jesus is angry with them and grieved at their reaction to his message.

Verses 5b-6: As in 2:10, the narrative reverts in mid-sentence from consideration of the opponents to the healing.[163] Jesus commands the man to stretch out his hand, he does so, and the hand is restored.

---

[163] The sentence in v. 5 does not present the syntactical difficulties of 2:10; however, the same shift from opponents to sick man occurs.

The completion of the miracle balances the beginning of the miracle in vv. 1b-3, forming the outer part of the ring composition. In each part, χείρ is mentioned twice (3:1,3, 5 bis); in the first part, "withered " is repeated (ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων, ξηρὰν...ἔχοντι); in the second, the verb "to stretch out" is repeated (ἔκτεινον, ἐξέτεινεν) In addition, λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ is used twice (vv. 3, 5), each time to introduce Jesus' command to the sick man. The commands frame the central part of the ring composition containing Jesus' address to his opponents.

Verse 6 reports the reaction of the opponents. They do not accuse Jesus of sabbath healing as one might expect from v. 2; perhaps because healing by word, not touch, is not illegal on the sabbath,[164] perhaps because in this story Jesus does not personally claim authority over the sabbath, or perhaps because it is too soon in the gospel for a formal charge leading to Jesus' trial and death. Rather the Pharisees leave the synagogue, the scene of the conflict. For the time being, Jesus is the victor.[165] The reader is informed, however, that the Pharisees immediately held counsel with the Herodians,[166] how to destroy Jesus. The reader is now aware that the opposition to Jesus has escalated to the point where some--the Pharisees and Herodians--wish to kill him.

---

[164] Vermes, Jesus, p. 25; Kolenkow, "Healing Controversy," pp. 636-637

[165] Geoltrain, "Violation," p. 84; Kolenkow, "Healing Controversy," p. 637.

[166] The question of who the Herodians were historically is beyond the scope of rhetorical analysis. In the gospel narrative, all that one can say with certainty is that Herod is associated with the death of John the Baptist, and Herod/the Herodians are associated with the Pharisees as opponents of Jesus (6:14-29; 3:6; 8:15; 12:13). See W.J. Bennett, Jr., "The Herodians of Mark's Gospel," NovT 17 (1975) 9-14.

The Pericope as a Whole

As the first controversy was a ring composition in which a healing framed a debate between Jesus and his opponents, so also the last controversy is a ring composition in which a miracle frames a debate. In the healing of the paralytic, however, the interposition of the debate within the miracle functioned to isolate the conflict from the ongoing development of the narrative. In the healing of the man with the withered hand, the atmosphere of conflict dominates the entire narrative.[167] In the opening miracle portion, the opponents seek to catch Jesus on a legal charge (v. 2), the first explicit indication in the gospel that the opponents wish to move against Jesus. In the middle section, Jesus virtually taunts the opponents with his question about doing good and saving life, and is angered and grieved with their lack of response.[168] Finally, after the healing, the Jewish leaders go out to seek Jesus' death. Conflict per se, not sabbath observance, appears to be the major focus in the final controversy. Verse 6 is the climax not only to this pericope, but to the entire section, spreading its note of impending doom over all the controversies.

---

[167] In comparison to 2:1-12, the opponents replace the role of the crowd at the beginning and the end of that narrative.

[168] Trocmé (Formation, p. 185, fn. 1) writes, "The attitude of Jesus in 3:1-5 amounts to a provocation of the leaders of Jewry."

The conflict in the last pericope is explicitly a matter of life and death: the opponents seek to accuse Jesus on what may be a capital offense (v. 2); Jesus′ question poses the alternatives of saving life or killing (v. 4); and finally the opopnents begin to plot to kill Jesus (v. 6). The ironic (and tragic) interplay of life and death pervades this pericope. As Albertz wrote, "Wie Jesus durch Unterlassung der Heilung Leben morden würde, so sind die Gegner im Herzen wirklich erstorben und finden daher nur den Ausweg des Mordanschlags."[169] From now on in the gospel narrative, Jesus stands under the threat of death. Jesus′ healing act has become a step on the way to the cross. And the Jewish leaders′ rejection of Jesus and his message is a step on the way to their own destruction (12:1-12).[170]

The Frame Around Mark 2:1-3:6

It was noted above that Mark 2:1-2 introduced an abrupt shift in the plot line from 1:45. In 1:45 Jesus was out in the country, unable to enter a city, and people were coming to him from everywhere. In 2:1, with no reason given, Jesus returns to Capernaum. Mark 3:7, following the controversy section, again presents a stark plot shift from 3:6: Jesus is in the country, with people flocking to him, and with no hint of opposition to him. Indeed, 3:7 picks up again exactly where 1:45 left off:

---

[169] Streitsgespräche, p. 12.

[170] See Lane, Mark, p. 125; Kelber, Kingdom, pp. 128-131. Budesheim ("Jesus", p. 209) appears correct in insisting that although the passage points to Jesus′ death, it is not yet an explicit theology of the cross.

> Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea, and a great multitude from Galilee followed; also from Judea and Jerusalem and Idumea, and from beyond the Jordan and from about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing all that he did, came to him. (3:7-8)

In 1:45, the people came to him πάντοθεν. In 3:7-8, the places, "everywhere," are specifically named. In 1:45, Jesus was no longer able to enter a city because of the crowds; in 3:9, Jesus has the disciples prepare a boat for him, lest the crowd should crush him on land. Opposition, conflict, the threat of death are put to one side, and the theme of the overwhelming popularity of Jesus is resumed.

The frame around 2:1-3:6 brackets the opposition in the controversy section exactly as the beginning and ending of the healing of the paralytic bracketed the conflict over blasphemy, Jesus' authority to forgive sins (2:6-10a).[171] Indeed, rhetorically, 2:1-3:6 is one large interposition. And the rhetorical function is the same: in each instance, the use of the rhetorical device of an interposition set in a frame has enabled the narrator to make the hearer aware of the depth and seriousness of the opposition to Jesus, without, at that point in the narrative, having to resolve the conflict. By means of the interposition of 2:1-3:6, the reader is now aware that some groups opposed Jesus from the beginning. He knows that the Jewish leaders reject Jesus and his message of the kingdom of God, to the point of wishing to destroy him. The reader is invited to side with Jesus and the kingdom or with the Pharisees. Meanwhile, the narrator, by bracketing or framing the controversy material, can continue the narrative of Jesus' activities without yet carrying the conflict to its conclusion on the cross.

---

[171] See above, pp. 128-129.

Summary

The analysis of the individual pericopes has highlighted a variety of rhetorical techniques and structures occurring in the text. Some of the rhetoric, such as the use of word repetition and shifts in word order in 2:18-20, has been quite elegant. Other rhetorical features, such as the interposition of 2:6-10a in 2:1-12, strike most modern readers as awkward.[172] Upon analysis, each of the pericopes was found to have a quite clearly defined rhetorical structure, identified on the basis of content, form, and word repetition. 2:1-12, 13-17, 23-28, and 3:1-6 are all tripartite patterns; 2:18-22 has a balanced two-part structure. 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 are ring compositions; 2:13-17 and 23-28, while not strictly delineated as ring compositions, show the third part in some connection with the first part. The device of an interposition set in a frame occurs both in 2:1-12 and 1:45-3:8.

Frequent and varied use of word repetition has been observed. In 2:1-12, 23-28 and 3:1-6, word repetition (hook word usage) aids in structuring the text. In 2:13-17, the repetition of "sinners" and "tax collectors" serves to unify the diverse elements of the text. In 2:18-22, the absence of word repetition between vv. 18-20 and 21-22--in contrast to the repeated use of word repetition within each set of verses--helps to indicate the rhetorical division of the pericope. Word repetition has been used to connect the narrative retrospectively to Mark 1:16-45 (2:1-2,13,14; 3:1), and to interconnect the pericopes within 2:1-3:6. Repetition has also been used for rhetorical emphasis in 2:1-12, 13-17 and 18-22. In regard to 2:10a, the first Son of man saying, extensive repetition has been used in order to stress the new, unrepeated material.

---

[172] It did not necessarily strike ancient readers as awkward. Both Matthew and Luke keep Mark's basic structure (Mt 9:1-8; Lk 5:17-26).

The text of 2:1-3:6, however "unliterary" its Greek may be, exhibits a considerable range and sophistication of rhetorical usage. The analysis of the rhetoric of the texts studied should make the perusal of 2:1-3:6 a richer aesthetic experience for the reader.

Moreover, the rhetorical analysis is helpful for the exegesis of the texts. It serves as a control for exegetical interpretations. For example, the rhetorical analysis of 2:6-10a shows that the saying on the Son of man in v. 10a cannot be a markan parenthetical aside to his reader for it is an integral part of the rhetorical structure and argument of 2:6-10a. Further, the analysis can help illumine the meaning and theological significance of a text. For example, attention to the rhetoric of 2:13-17 makes the reader aware of the emphasis on the disciples and the nature of their relationship to Jesus.

Finally, the rhetorical analysis provides upon occasion some assistance to redaction and form critics. Negatively, it demonstrates that 2:1-12 need not be explained as the interpolation of a controversy into a miracle narrative. The present form of 2:1-12 may equally well be explained on the hypothesis that the material was originally a healing controversy apophthegm. The "clumsiness" of the literary seams which modern readers usually adduce as evidence for interpolation may be the result of employing the interposition-frame technique to set off the controversy from the on-going narrative. Positively, the results of the rhetorical approach suggest, for example, that the emphasis upon the disciples in 2:13-17 is due to redaction not tradition. Thus, rhetorical criticism would seem to be a useful, indeed a necessary, tool for the redaction and form critic.

CHAPTER IV

SECOND READING OF MARK 2:1-3:6

In the first reading of Mark 2:1-3:6, the rhetorical techniques within the individual pericopes and between successive pericopes were described and discussed. In the second reading, the focus will be upon the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 as a whole. First, the concentric and chiastic rhetorical pattern of 2:1-3:6 will be described. Second, the significance of the overall rhetorical structure for understanding the meaning or theology of the Galilean controversy section will be discussed.

The Rhetorical Pattern of Mark 2:1-3:6 as a Whole

The results of the first reading

As noted earlier, the second reading builds upon the results of the first reading. Several of the major results of the first reading are important indicators of the overall rhetorical structure:

First, the opposition to Jesus, evident in all five stories, climaxes in the last one in which the opponents seek grounds to accuse Jesus, and at the end plot to destroy him. Further, the five controversies are framed by 1:45 and 3:7-8 in which Jesus' popularity is stressed and opposition to him is absent. These two observations suggest a linear or climactic development within 2:1-3:6 which is not the linear development of the larger narrative. This phenomenon will be returned to in the discussion of the significance of the structure.

Second, the first two pericopes, the healing of the paralytic and the call of Levi/eating with sinners are concerned with Jesus' relation to sin and sinners. There is continuity of subject matter and the presence of hook words between the two pericopes. Similarly, the last two pericopes, plucking grain on the sabbath and healing on the sabbath, both concern sabbath observance. Here also, there is continuity of content and the presence of hook words. In contrast, the middle pericope is concerned with fasting, not with sin or sabbath. It has no hook words joining it to the preceding or following pericopes.[1] It also differs from the other four in that no specific opponents are introduced. These facts suggest that 2:1-3:6 may have a three-part structure of sin-fasting-sabbath (2:1-17, 18-22, 23-3:6).

Third, the first and last pericopes are both healing controversies with the healing at the end. The cast of characters includes Jesus, a sick man, and the opponents. The three middle pericopes, on the other hand, are all controversies of the action-objection-vindication type. They report no healings. The cast of characters includes Jesus, the disciples, and opponents. These facts suggest that 2:1-3:6 may be a ring composition of healing controversy, followed by non-healing controversies involving the disciples, followed by healing controversy (2:1-12, 13-28; 3:1-6).

---

[1] "Pharisees" might be considered a hook word connecting the middle pericope with second, fourth, and fifth. However, it is better understood as a key word. It is part of the sequence of opponents in 2:1-3:6 and part of the rhetorical structure of 2:18-20. It does not appear to function as a hook word indicating structure in 2:1-3:6.

The second and third groups of observations considered together suggest that the structure or rhythm of the Galilean controversy section is more complex than a three-part pattern or a ring composition. The second reading or rhetorical analysis of the interrelationships of the five pericopes will show that 2:1-3:6 has a tight and well-worked out concentric and chiastic structure. The pericopes may be labelled as follows:

A	2:1-12	The healing of the paralytic
B	2:13-17	The call of Levi/eating with sinners
C	2:18-22	The sayings on fasting and on the old and the new
B′	2:23-27	Plucking grain on the sabbath
A′	3:1-6	The healing on the sabbath

The two healings (A and A′) are parallel to each other. The call of Levi and the plucking of grain (B and B′) have many parallel elements. The question of fasting (C) is a middle unit without a parallel pericope. It is related to B and B′ in one way and to A and A′ in a different way. First, the rhetorical indicators connecting A and A′, B and B′, and defining C′s place in the structure will be described. Then the pattern as a whole will be summarized.

Rhetorical analysis of the elements of the concentric structure

A and A′. The two healing controversies. As noted in the first reading of 3:1-6,[2] the parallelism of structure between 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 is for Jesus' address to his opponents, and then resumed. This rhetorical pattern, miracle initiated-debate-miracle completed, is found only in these two narratives in Mark and their synoptic parallels.[3] In both stories, the miracle portion of the narrative is ended and then resumed by parallel addresses by Jesus to the man being healed. In the first healing, the addresses are introduced by λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ (2:5,10); in the second by λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ (3:3,5). The repetition of λέγει τῷ... not only helps to structure each pericope but also to emphasize the parallelism between them.

The parallelism of A and A' may be recognized as well in various details of content, form and hook word usage. The pericopes open with virtually identical introductions: A, Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς (2:1), and A', Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς (3:1).[4] Both occur indoors: A in a house, A' in a synagogue. In neither story do the opponents of Jesus openly state their opposition. Thus, in both, Jesus may be said to take the initiative. In the first, A, Jesus knows that they debate in their "hearts;" in the last, A′, Jesus is grieved at their hardness of "heart." These are the first uses of "heart" in the gospel[5] and the word is not used again until 6:52 in which the disciples′ hearts are hardened. In both A and A′, Jesus responds to unspoken opposition with a counter-question: "Which is easier, to say...or to say...?" (2:9), "Is it lawful on the sabbath to do...or to do..." (3:4).

---

[2] See above,

[3] Mt 9:1-8; Lk 5:17-26; 6:6-11. In Matthew's version of the healing of the withered hand, the healing occurs only at the end (Mt 12:9-14).

[4] The verbal similarity might be the result of Mark's use of his typical introductory formulas. Unlike the frequent appearance of ἔρχομαι and ἐξέρχομαι, however, εἰσέρχομαι does not appear elsewhere in Mark as the first verb in a pericope introduction. According to Gaston's statistical study (Horae, p. 72), εἰσέρχομαι is not used significantly more often in markan editorial verses than in verses in which Mark is generally considered dependent upon tradition.

The healings are also similar. Both are accomplished by word alone. Neither is a cleansing or an exorcism, but rather the restoration of parts of the body.[6] These healings might be described as resurrection-type healings.[7] The symbolism of death-resurrection is implied in the narrative of the healing of the paralytic as Farrer argues:

> The man is carried by four bearers, like the dead going to burial. Unable to come at Christ otherwise, they dig out (St Mark′s word) a hole and lower him into his grave. Thus descending, he falls in the presence of the Son of God, and "stands up on his feet"....The miracle of the paralytic carries the symbolism of the resurrection almost as far as it will go.[8]

---

[5] Used twice in the first story.

[6] Farrer (Mark, pp. 47-48) and Mourlon Beernaert ("Jésus controversé," p. 139) stress the parallelism between the healing of feet or legs in the first story, and the healing of the arm in the second. Mark, however, does not mention legs or even lameness in regard to the paralytic.

[7] Edward C. Hobbs, "The Gospel of Mark and the Exodus," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1952), passim.

[8] Mark, p. 47. So also Jean Radermakers, La bonne nouvelle de

The withered hand is also "resurrected." Bowman writes, "Life has been given to his apparently dead hand."[9] The verb ἔγειρω is used three times in the story of the paralytic and once in the story of the withered hand, in the rather odd expression, ἔγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον (3:3). The expression serves to bring the verb into the story.

Finally, each narrative closes with the description of the reaction of the onlooker, "the impression the miracle creates on the crowd."[10] The content of the reactions is not parallel but antithetic. The crowd responds to the first with amazement and glorification of God (2:1-12). The opponents respond to the healing of the man with the withered hand by beginnng to plot to destroy Jesus (3:6). The reaction in 3:6 is hostile, not admiring, but it seems nonetheless to fill the slot in the miracle form of the response of the audience.[11]

Thus A, the healing of the paralytic, and A′, the healing of the man with the withered arm, are constructed in a closely parallel manner as shown by structure, form, content and word repetition. The detailed similarities seem well beyond any parallelism which might

---

Jésus selon saint Mark (Brussels: Institut d'Études Théologiques, 1974), Vol. 2, p. 92.

[9] Mark, p. 121. See also Lightfoot, Gospel Message, p. 29.

[10] Bultmann, History, p. 225.

[11] Tagawa (Miracles, p. 12) views 3:6 as taking the place of the miracle acclamation. For him, it demonstrates that controversy not miracle is the center of interest.

result from the use of the same form.[12]

B and B′. The controversies over eating with sinners and plucking grain on the sabbath. As noted above, B is set in relation to A, and B′ to A′. A and B concern sin/sinners. In both, the crowd (and the larger group of tax collectors and sinners) play an important role. B′ and A′ are concerned with violation of the sabbath law. In these two pericopes, the crowd no longer plays any part. Also, as noted earlier, B and B′ share several characteristics with C, over against A and A′. B, C and B′ are controversies of the action-objection-vindication type; they report no healing; they include the disciples in their cast of characters. Finally, B and B′ have parallels of structure, form, content and word repetition with each other. The multiple relationships of B and B′ with A, C and A′ and with each other should not surprise the reader. In the rising and falling oral pattern of a symmetrical composition, the intermediate elements between the extremes and the center may well balance each other as well as be related, each to what precedes and follows it.[13]

The parallelism between B and B′ is strongly marked. Story B opens with Jesus out of doors, beside the sea, calling Levi from his tax office to be a disciple, calling a sinner who is in the middle of sinning (2:13-14). Jesus then enters Levi's house. It closes with a general proverb, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick," followed immediately by the implied christological or "I" saying: "I came not to call the righteous but sinners" (2:17).[14]

---

[12] This fact is of obvious importance for the form or redaction critic interested in determining the tradition history of the two pericopes.

[13] The multiple relationships, however, do complicate the form critic′s task of determining the "original" form and subsequent tradition history of the individual pericopes. He must not only consider the various possibilities of internal development but also the possibilities of adaptation of the individual traditions to fit a larger rhetorical pattern.

Story B′ similarly begins out of doors, in the fields, with the disciples breaking the sabbath law by plucking grain (2:23). In vv. 25-26, David is pictured indoors in the house of God. It ends with the general proverb, "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath," followed immediately by the christological saying, "So the Son of man is lord also of the sabbath." The content of B and B′ is different (sin and sabbath) but the structure is the same. In both instances, the final proverb and christological claim may justify the initial action.

The central sections of B and B′ (vv. 15-16, 25-26), moreover, are concerned *not* with sinners or sabbath; both are explicitly concerned with *eating*. In B, Jesus enters a house (as story A took place in a house) and eats with tax collectors and sinners. The fact that Jesus is eating is stressed four times, and the verb ἐσθίω is used twice in the present tense. In B′, Jesus refers to the scriptural incident of David entering the house of God (as A′ takes place in a synagogue), eating the bread of the presence and giving it also to "those with him." 'Εσθίω is used twice in the aorist. In story B, Jesus and his disciples eat with tax collectors and sinners, something not proper in the light of the rabbinic laws of ritual cleanliness. In B′, David and his followers ate food which was not lawful for them to eat.

---

[14] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 152, 155-156.

In story B, eating is an integral part of the controversy: the opponents question why Jesus eats with tax collectos and sinners (v. 16). Yet Jesus′ answer in v. 17 does not explicitly justify eating with sinners. The opponents would agree that a doctor must go among the sick in order to heal them, but they would argue that his purpose in going is to heal them, not to catch the disease--to become a sinner--himself. In B′, eating is not an essential part of the controversy. The relevance of the example of David eating the showbread as a justification for the disciples′ breaking of the sabbath work laws is doubtful.[15] However, the Davidic example could be used as a justification for eating with sinners. The story of Peter and Cornelius in Acts 10:1-11:18 shows that the image of eating forbidden food may serve to justify the reception of Gentiles into the church. In Acts, the connection was that both the food and the people were considered unclean. In Mark 2:15-16, 25-26, the connection would be that both eating with sinners and eating the showbread were unlawful. The function of the Davidic reference in B′ may well be to justify

---

[15] See above, p. 171.

UMI

Jesus' eating with sinners in B, rather than to justify the breaking of the sabbath law in B'.[16] David broke the law when he had need (χρείαν ἔσχεν, v. 25); Jesus asserted that the sick, not the well, need a physician (χρείαν ἔχουσιν, v. 17). The inclusion of the Davidic reference in B' establishes a strong chiastic relationship between B and B' _and_ serves to introduce the subject of eating into B'.

C. The question of fasting and of the old and new. The literary interrelationships and correlations of the first two and the last two controversy stories seem sufficiently numerous, significant and precise to establish that A,B and B',A are a well-worked out chiasm. Thus C is the middle section of the literary pattern by definition.

The rhetorical pattern of story C differs from the other four. The others all fall rhetorically into three major parts. A and A' are ring compositions, with the miracle at the beginning and the end. B might be described as two situations with one dominical response (2:13-14, 15-16, 17), and B' as one situation with two dominical responses (2:23-24, 25-26, 27-28). Story C, on the other hand, falls rhetorically into two halves: the question and answer on fasting (vv. 18-20) and the sayings on the old and the new (vv. 21-22). The other four pericopes are connected to each other rhetorically by hook words; C is not.

---

[16] If vv. 25-26 are interpreted as justifying Jesus' behavior in vv. 15-16, then the fact that it is holy bread in vv. 24-25 may be support for those who argue for allusions to the messianic banquet in vv. 15-17.

C also differs from the other controversies in its content. Each of the other four has an explicit setting: in a house, by the sea/in a house; in the fields/in the house of God; in a synagogue. C is completely without indication of setting. In the other four controversies, the opponents are specifically named: scribes, the scribes of the Pharisees, then Pharisees, and the Pharisees with the Herodians In story C, the opponents are not specified.[17] Finally, in C alone, two time periods are explicitly contrasted, the time before and the time after Jesus' death.[18]

These rhetorical and content differences serve to set C apart from the other four controversy stories. It stands alone as the middle pericope of the five. It is not closely connected rhetorically with any of the others, all of which are closely interwoven with each other.

At the same time, however, C is set in relation to B and B'. C shares with B and B' the absence of any healing and the presence of the disciples. Further, it, like B and B',. is concerned with eating. The verb "to eat" is not used in C; instead the verb "to fast" is used--six times. Fasting in C is contrasted with eating in B and B'. Thus all three middle pericopes are concerned in some way with eating. In B, Jesus eats with the wrong people. In C, the disciples do not fast. In B′, Jesus cites the example of David eating unlawful food. And in all three stories, the disciples are associated directly or indirectly with eating: they too eat with sinners; they do not fast; David′s followers were also given the unlawful food. Thus, B, C and B′ have a common content which A and A′ do not share: religiously or legally "objectionable" eating in which the disciples are included.

---

[17] See above, p. 160.

[18] Giuseppe G. Gamba, "Considerazioni in margine alla poetica di Mc 2,1-12," Salesianum 28 (1966) 331.

C also has a commonality of content with A and A′. However, it is not a relationship of manifest content but of theme: death/destruction vs. life/resurrection. Since the relationship is one of theme, not of manifest content clearly evident in the text, it will be discussed below as part of the significance of the structure, rather than here as part of the argument for the existence of the structure.

Summary of the structure

Thus the five controversy stories of Mark 2:1-3:6 form a tightly-constructed literary unit which has a quite elegant symmetrical pattern: the first two stories have to do with sin; the last two with the sabbath law; the first and last stories describe resurrection-type healings; the second, third and fourth in some way concern eating; the disciples play a role in the middle three controversies but not in the first or last one.

The pattern may be observed not only in general content, but also in structure, and details of content, form and word repetition. The parallelism of A and A′ is extensive on the basis of all the criteria. The relationships of B and B′ are elaborate. They are parallel to each other in their shift of setting from outdoors to indoors, in their common content of eating in the middle verses and their common structure in their closings. Further, B is rhetorically related to A, and B′ to A′, while both B and B′ are related to C. The central pericope, C, is in some ways set apart rhetorically from the other four pericopes, and in other ways related to them. The sheer number of congruent parallelisms, both major and minor, noted in the text, demonstrates that the concentric literary pattern is truly to be found in the text itself.

The elegance of the pattern in all its detail need not imply that the composer or compiler of 2:1-3:6 constructed it with a worked-out geometric model in mind. For the pattern at its base is quite simple, a rising and falling rhythm of healing-eating-healing developed in regard to the issues of sin and sabbath. This may suggest that the redactor worked from a preliminary plan, as many ancient authors did.[19]

Mark 2:1-3:6, however elaborate its pattern, remains a series of conflict stories. The opponents move from silent criticism of Jesus in the first story, to the questioning of Jesus′ disciples, to the questioning of Jesus himself, to trying to find grounds for a legal accusation, finally to plotting to destroy him. This sequence may be a literary device to lend a sense of progression and climax to an otherwise content-structured unit.

---

[19] See Talbert, Literary Patterns, p. 79.

The Significance of the Structure for the Meaning of Mark 2:1-3:6

Since the rhetorical structure of a literary text does not exist apart from the content of the text, since the determination of structure is based to a considerable degree on content (e.g., healing, sabbath, conflict, etc.), the discussion of the significance of the structure is basically a discussion of how the structuring of the content helps the reader to interpret that content. The discussion will be in four parts: first, the contribution of the linear or climactic development to the understanding of 2:1-3:6; second, the contribution of the concentric pattern to its understanding; third, a consideration of the occurrence of the title, Son of man, in 2:10 (A) and 2:28 (B′); and last, a consideration of the role of the disciples in 2:1-3:6.

Linear or climactic development in 2:1-3:6

Mark 2:1-12 as the introduction to the controversy section. In her introduction to her study of Mark 2:1-12, Maisch writes that it is not clear how to entitle the pericope: should it be "the healing of the paralytic," "the forgiveness of sins through Jesus," "the first controversy of Jesus with his opponents," or "the authority of Jesus as Son of man"?[20] She concludes that the authority of Jesus is the most appropriate designation for the narrative.[21] Budesheim, on the contrary, opts for conflict,[22] while Hultgren sees the forgiveness of sins as the central issue.[23]

---

[20] Gelähmten, p. 9. [21] Ibid., pp. 127-128.

This scholarly debate need not be resolved. A controversy apophthegm, unlike a parable, does not have a single major point. Even as an independent unit in the tradition, a controversy apophthegm inevitably includes three major elements--conflict between adversaries, the actual subject matter of the conflict, and the vindication or triumph of the hero. The vindication of the hero may be demonstrated by a resolution of the actual issue under debate, by a dismissal or adroit avoidance of the issue, or by the hero's claim to be above the issue on the basis of his status or mission. In Mark 2:1-12, Jesus' healing begun by means of a forgiveness formula sparks the conflict with opponents over Jesus' right to act for God, which Jesus vindicates by his claim to be the Son of man with authority on earth. All four of the aspects of 2:1-12 that Maisch describes are an integral part of the story of the paralytic.

Furthermore, all four aspects are resumed and developed in the ensuing controversy stories. A person hearing or reading Mark 2:1-3:6 might focus first on Jesus' exraordinary miracle-working power stressed in 2:12, then on Jesus' power over sin as he hears the story of the call of Levi and Jesus' eating with tax collectors and sinners. The reader's attention then would be drawn to Jesus' special status with

---

[22] "Jesus," pp. 190, 192 (at least in its present redaction).

[23] "Adversaries," p. 200.

God, the aspect introduced in the first Son of man saying (2:10), reinforced by Jesus' saying on his mission to call sinners (2:17) and by his metaphor of the bridegroom (2:19-20), and climaxing in the second Son of man sayng asserting lordship over the sabbath (2:28). Finally, as the last controversy again involving a healing is heard, or read, the reader's attention would turn to the continuing opposition to Jesus, first introduced in the story about the paralytic, reinforced by the continuing series of debates, and climaxing in the last narrative, in which the opponents plot to destroy Jesus (3:6). Thus, Mark 2:1-3:6 serves for the reader as an introduction for the entire controversy section.

The heightening of conflict. The earlier discussion of possible premarkan Galilean controversy collections highlighted the fact that any concatenation of controversy apophthegms serves to stress both the opposition to the hero and the hero's triumph over the opposition.[24] The predominant thrust of a series of controversies depends on how the opposition is developed from controversy to controversy and the note upon which the series of controversies end.

In 2:1-3:6, the element of opposition is gradually heightened for the reader until its climax in 3:1-6. In the first story, the seriousness of the threat to Jesus, the possibility of a charge of blasphemy, is muted for the reader by employment of the interposition technique and the favorable reaction of the crowd at the end. In the second story, the opponents question the disciples. In the fourth, the reader is told that the opponents are watching Jesus in order to make a legal charge against him, and finally that they begin plotting how to destroy him. This sequence or linear development places the emphasis of the entire controversy section on the opposition Jesus' actions have aroused. Further, the fact that the notices of opposition in 3:1-6 are information given to the reader only and not to the internal audience of the story,[25] indicates that a, if not the, major function of the Galilean controversy section in the gospel of Mark is to make the reader aware of the opposition to Jesus. The emphasis in 2:1-3:6 is not upon Jesus' triumph over his opponents, but on their implacable hostility.[26]

---

[24] See above, pp. 90-91.

Mark 3:1-6 as the conclusion to the controversy section. The Galilean controversy section stresses not only the fact of conflict but also the serious or fundamental nature of the conflict. The first story poses the alternatives of Jesus as blasphemer or Jesus as the legitimate Son of man. As noted in the first reading, the final controversy makes explicit that the outcome of the conflict is a matter of life or death. 3:1-6 adds no new subject matter for conflict.[27] Rather it serves as a conclusion to the whole series summing up the absoluteness of the conflict: what Jesus considers doing good or making alive, his opponents consider sufficiently harmful to warrant his death. 3:1-6 also hints at the outcome of the conflict--Jesus' death. Whatever else 2:1-3:6 in the context of Mark's gospel may convey to the reader, it certainly conveys that Jesus and the opponents are on a collision course leading towards Jesus' death. Mark 2:1-3:6 might perhaps be compared in musical terms to the statement of a major theme early in a musical work, which then hangs ominously over the composition, but which only comes to dominate the music much later in the piece.

---

[25] Geoltrain, "Violation," p. 84; Via, Kerygma, p. 149.

[26] The opposite pattern, stressing the triumph of Jesus, may be seen in the public debates in Mk 12. See below, pp. 282-283.

[27] Budesheim, "Jesus," p. 204.

The concentric pattern as an aid to understanding Mark 2:1-3:6

Perhaps the most important function of the symmetrical pattern in 2:1-3:6 is to create a coherent literary unity out of episodic incidents, to bind the incidents into an organic whole.[28] The controversy section is not just a concatenation of miscellaneous acts of Jesus to which the opponents increasingly take exception. The effect of the literary unity of the section on the reader is to emphasize that the opponents objected to Jesus' activity as a whole, and to the messianic claim which was the basis of Jesus' actions.

The literary unity of the Galilean controversy section means that the individual parts of the section can only be fully understood in the context of the larger structure. Thus recognition of the structural pattern can be of considerable assistance to the twentieth century exegete in his attempt to understand Mark 2:1-3:6.[29] First, awareness of the pattern can help to elucidate the meaning of individual elements in the section which are otherwise obscure or a matter of debate. Second, awareness of the organization of individual elements into a larger structure leads to recognition of themes which are brought out in the narrative as a whole more forcefully than in the individual elements.[30] Third, awareness of the rhetorical pattern can make the reader aware of contrasts or paradoxes implicit in the narrative, greatly enriching his experience of the text.

---

[28] Of course, a symmetrical pattern is not the only way to create a coherent organic literary unit; it is, however, one way to do so.

The usefulness of the rhetorical analysis of 2:1-3:6 for interpreting the meaning of the text will be discussed under three headings: xegesis of individual elements, the role of healing and eating, and the theme of life vs. death. The issues of the occurrence of the title Son of man, and of the role of the disciples, will be held for separate consideration.

---

[29] Recognition of the structural pattern also has important implications for the form and redaction critic studying 2:1-3:6. The focus of the discussion here, however, is not on the historical questions of the original form, tradition history and redaction of the text, but on how the literary features of the final text help to illumine its theology.

[30] This statement applies to any literary pattern, not just symmetrical ones. For example, our recognition of the literary pattern, repeated three times, of passion prediction, misunderstanding of the disciples, teaching on discipleship, has contributed significantly to our understanding of the role of the disciples in Mark and of the theology of Mark.

Exegesis of individual elements. The concentric and chiastic rhetorical pattern is particularly helpful in interpreting the material contained in B and B′. As noted earlier, the meaning of Jesus′ citation of the scriptural incident of David eating the showbread is more fully grasped when it is seen not only in relation to its own pericope, B′, the plucking of the grain on the sabbath, but also in relation to its parallel pericope, B, eating with sinners. Further, the parallel structure of the ending of B and B′, a general proverb followed by a christological or I saying (2:17, 27-28), suggests that the proverb about the sick not the well needing a physician is to be understood as a generally applicable saying. The physician is not to be interpreted as a christological metaphor analogous to the metaphor of the bridegroom in 2:19-20.[31]

Retrospectively, A′ helps to interpret A for the reader. The fact that in A′ the opponents are searching for legal grounds on which to accuse Jesus recalls to the reader′s mind the opponents′ objection in A that Jesus blasphemes (2:7), and that blasphemy can be a capital offense. In retrospect, A as well as A′ suggests the possibility (or inevitability) of Jesus′ death at the hands of his opponents. What is explicit in A′ is implicit in A.

The role of healing and eating. The symmetrical pattern, the ring composition of healing-eating-healing, emphasizes that Jesus′

---

[31] Contra Minette de Tillesse, Secret, p. 124; Geoltrain, "Violation," p. 74; Via, Kerygma, p. 133; Mourlon Beernaert, "Jésus controversé," p. 141.

objectionable behavior is associated with the activities of healing and eating. Neither activity is in itself illegal behavior. Both activities are a fundamental part of Jesus′ ministry in the proclamation and bringing of the kingdom. In Mark 1, preceding the controversies, Jesus has already worked three specific miracles, an exorcism, the "raising" of Peter′s mother-in-law, and the cleansing of a leper (1:23-27, 30-31, 40-44), as well as healing "many who were sick with various diseases" and casting out "many demons" (1:34). In Mark 1, he ate a meal with the four men he had called to be disciples (1:29-31). Healings continue to be an important part of Jesus′ ministry in Mark 1-10, and eating is also stresed in the spectacular feedings of the 5,000 and the 4,000 and in the institution of the last supper (6:30-44; 8:1-10; 14:22-25). Later on in Mark′s narrative both healing and eating again become the subject of controversy (3:22-30; 7:1-23).[32]

In 2:1-3:6, healing and eating are yoked together by the concentric pattern. The issues of sin and sabbath are each raised in regard to both healing and eating (A,B; B′,A′). Thus the structure of 2:1-3:6 helps to underline for the reader the fundamental nature of the conflict between Jesus and his opponents. Opposition arises not because of Jesus′ incidental violation of specific religious pieties or laws which could have been avoided. It arises because Jesus′ basic ministry included as prominent elements healing and eating behavior which could not be accommodated in the wine skins of the Judaism of the time.[33]

---

[32] Note also that the feeding of the four thousand is followed immediately by the Pharisees′ demand for a sign from heaven (8:1-13).

The theme of life vs. death. In A and A′, Jesus visibly triumphs over his opponents in the two "resurrection-type" healings.[34] The objections of the opponents, on the other hand, are issues which could lead to death for the healer.[35] In A, the charge is blasphemy, the charge upon which the Sanhedrin eventually condemns Jesus to death (2:7; 14:64). A healing on the sabbath which was not necessary to preserve life could also be a capital charge.[36] While Jesus avoids grounds for legal accusation in A′,[37] the opponents nonetheless begin to plot how to destroy him.

Thus both the first and last controversies contain at least implicitly the themes of resurrection and death. These themes are made explicit in Jesus′ saying in A′, in which he presents the opponents with the either/or of saving life or killing (3:4). Jesus chooses to save life in restoring the withered hand; the opponents choose to kill in plotting against Jesus (3:5-6).

---

[33] The association of eating with healing in 2:1-3:6 suggests that Jesus′ table-fellowship with sinners as the historical cause of Jesus′ offense to the Jews may not be so far removed from the present gospel tradition as Perrin suggested. See above, p. 155, fn. 95.

[34] See above, pp. 199-200.

[35] On the connection of healing controversy and death, see Kolenkow, "Healing Controversy," pp. 623-638.

[36] See above, p. 184. [37] See above, p. 188.

C, like A and A′, reflects implicitly the theme of death vs. life. In C, however, there are no specifically named opponents, and not fasting is not a legal offense, let alone a capital charge. In C, it is Jesus himself who alludes to his own death (2:20). Then, without interruption, Jesus speaks of the threat the new poses for the continued existence of the old (2:21-22). Now it is the opponents, the guardians of the old way of Judaism, who stand under the threat of destruction. It is not until the parable of the wicked tenants that the reader (and the opponents) are clearly told that the death of Jesus, the son, will lead to the destruction of the opponents as well (12:1-12). In 2:1-3:6, by means of the concentric structure, the reader is alerted that 3:6, the climax of the linear development, may not be the end of the story.[38]

The occurrence of the theme of death vs. life in A, C and A′ corresponds surprisingly well to Lund′s "laws" of concentric structure.[39] Similar ideas are expressed in the extremes and center of the pattern and not elsewhere. The theme of death vs. life is not found in B or B′. An opposite idea is introduced in the center, before the original trend is resumed. The section as a whole shows the growing opposition to Jesus pointing ahead to his death; C, the central section, points beyond Jesus' death to the continued existence of the disciples, who will then fast, and to the possibility of destruction for the opponents (2:20, 21-22). A great deal has been conveyed to the reader through the five controversy stories--about Jesus' ministry, the objections to it of the Jewish opponents, the possibility of Jesus' death, and the destruction of the opponents, the continued life of the new community.

---

[38] Via (Kerygma, p. 117) may well be right in asserting that "the opposition death/resurrection is the fundamental kernel out of which the narrative as a whole develops." It would not appear, however, that "the kingdom is the possibility of gaining life through death," is a point made in 2:1-3:6 (Ibid., p. 133 [italics mine]).

[39] See above, pp. 64-66.

Excursus on the Son of man in 2:10 and 28

In this instance, the question is not how does the structure of 2:1-3:6 help us to understand the meaning of the Son of man sayings in this section. The meaning seems evident enough: Jesus as Son of man has authority on earth over sin and the sabbath. The question, rather, is how does the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 help the reader to understand the function and importance of the two sayings.

Rhetorically, the double use of the Son of man title stands outside of the symmetrical pattern of 2:1-3:6. 2:10 occurs in the interposition in A; 2:28 at the end of B'. This fact, combined with the observations that these are the only two uses of Son of man in the sense of earthly authority in the synoptic tradition, and the only uses in Mark prior to 8:31, may suggest that the occurrences of the title in 2:1-3:6 are due to the redactor's unmodified incorporation of tradition.

Such a position is difficult to maintain, however, since each individual saying is rhetorically stressed. 2:10 stands out by virtue of the repetition in which it is imbedded.[40] 2:28 is emphasized by virtue of its climactic place as the punch line of the controversy form. Each individual saying calls attention to itself. The double use would certainly strike the listener or reader. A redactor who could create the rhetorical richness of 2:1-3:6 would hardly overlook the rhetorical stress on Son of man in the composition.[41]

A single asymmetrical stressed element would not appear to undermine the existence of a balanced concentric structure such as 2:1-3:6. In the first place, balanced literary patterns (whether symmetrical or repetitive parallelism) in the ancient world normally contained asymmetric elements. Ancient authors on rhetoric or literary criticism may be cited either praising the lack of perfect balance or condemning too perfect balance.[42] (The fact that it is apparently easier to find such statements in ancient writings than statements arguing for extended balance perhaps implies that balance in literary compositions was taken for granted, consciously or unconsciously.)[43] In the second place, from a rhetorical perspective, an effective way to emphasize an element is to make it stand out from the general rhetorical pattern.

---

[40] See above, pp. 127-128.

[41] Of course, the sayings may well derive from the tradition. My argument is that the redactor has not incorporated them blindly.

[42] For discussion and examples, see Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 77-79.

[43] It may be recalled that neither chiasm or ring composition, rhetorical terms used by classical scholars, were rhetorical categories of the ancient rhetoricians.

The sayings in 2:10 and 28 serve to stress Jesus' earthly authority as Son of man, that is to express an aspect of christology. The other christological material in 2:1-3:6, the "I came" saying in 2:17b and the bridegroom image in 2:19-20,[44] are also connected with Jesus' earthly ministry expressing its mission or the joy associated with it. Together with the Son of man sayings, they provide for the reader the basis for and the justification of Jesus' acts. Only the two Son of man sayings, however, concern directly the issue of Jesus' authority. By their occurrence in A and B', they assert Jesus' authority over sin and sabbath, whether in matters of healing or eating.[45]

The conflicts described in 2:1-3:6, however, do not appear to center on the issue of Jesus' authority. Other controversies in Mark are over the source or legitimacy of Jesus' authority (3:22-30; 11:27-33). In 2:1-3:6, the issue of Jesus' authority is raised by the opponents in the first story, when they say to themselves that Jesus blasphemes (2:7). The opponents, however, do not raise the authority issue again in 2:1-3:6. Instead, they continue to object to Jesus' or the disciples' behavior relating to healing and eating, sin and sabbath. In the final controversy, the opponents are watching to see what Jesus will do, and Jesus' saying contains no christological material at all. The opponents are concerned with what Jesus does and not with who he is or claims to be.

---

[44] On the physician, see above, p. 214.

[45] Thus there is a symmetrical balance between the two Son of man sayings: one use in regard to sin and healing and one in regard to sabbath and eating. However, 2:10 is part of the rhetorical unit of the interposition in A; 2:28 is part of the rhetorical unit B' delimited in 2:23-28. They are not rhetorically parallel.

The linear development of 2:1-3:6 has shown that conflict between Jesus and the Jewish leaders is a major theme of 2:1-3:6. Since the conflict is over behavior, not christology, it would seem that the narrator is not using the material in 2:1-3:6 to argue for (or against) a christological position. The emphases of the concentric structure on healing and eating and on the theme of life vs. death also suggest that christology, "Son of man talk," is not among the major theological intentions of the narrator in 2:1-3:6.

Nonetheless, the section does contain considerable christological material. From the rhetorical perspective, the christological material seems to be assumed or taken for granted by the narrator. The treatment of the christological material would imply that the narrator intends his writing for an audience which shares the christological assumptions of 2:1-3:6. Similarly, from the redactional perspective, Kelber writes in regard to 2:1-3:6, "Mark uses Son of Man to establish rapport with his [Mark's] opponents because it was under this title that Jesus was known to them."[46] It would not seem necessary to presuppose markan opponents in 2:1-3:6. It is sufficient to say that the author of 2:1-3:6 assumes that his audience shares his christology with his audience at this point; he does not argue for it.

The double use of the title Son of man remains a striking feature of 2:1-3:6, even if it does not appear to reflect any of the narrator's major theological intentions in the controversy section. Looking beyond 2:1-3:6 in Mark's gospel, the stress on Son of man with earthly authority appears to serve a useful rhetorical function in preparing the reader for the later (and clearly polemical) uses of Son of man for the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus. As Perrin wrote, the two sayings "serve the function of equating the authority of Jesus with that of the Son of man."[47] This equation needs to be made before the passion prediction in 8:31, if 8:31 is to be understood by the reader. Thus the occurrence of Son of man, both rhetorically stressed and outside the rhetorical symmetrical pattern, serves mainly to prepare the way for later developments in the narrative, not to illumine the meaning of the Galilean controversy section.

---

[46] Kingdom, p. 22.

Excursus on the role of the disciples in Mark 2:1-3:6

In recent scholarly debate over the theology of Mark, much attention has been paid to the role of the disciples, and to their "misunderstanding" or "blindness."[48] However, neither in studying the role of the disciples in Mark, nor in studying 2:1-3:6 has much attention been paid to the disciples in 2:1-3:6.[49] Yet the rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-3:6 has brought to light the prominence of the role of the disciples in the Galilean controversy section.

---

[47] "High Priest's Question," p. 90.

[48] See especially Weeden, Mark; Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," pp. 161-170. See also Joanna Dewey, Disciples of the Way: Mark on Discipleship (Women's Division, Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church, 1976).

[49] A notable exception is Budesheim, "Jesus" (see below, p. 223, fn. 50; p. 226, fn. 55). Knox (Sources, Vol. 1, p. 16) and Hultgren ("Adversaries," p. 131) also note the prominence of the disciples in the controversies.

In the first reading of the individual pericopes, the prominence of the disciples in B, C and B′ was observed. In B, 2:13-17, by means of the call of Levi, the first use of the term "disciple," the statement that many were following Jesus, and the fact that the question about Jesus′ behavior is addressed to the disciples not Jesus, the disciples are brought to the forefront of the reader′s attention.[50] In C, the fourfold use of the terms "disciples" and of "those associated with the bridegroom" in vv. 18-20 again places the emphasis upon the disciples in regard to the question of fasting. In B′, 2:23-27, the stress upon the disciples is sustained by the fact that it is they who violate the sabbath rest and whose behavior is attacked, and by the inclusion of those with David along with David in the Old Testament reference (vv. 23-24,25-26).

In the second reading, the rhetorical structure of the section as a whole, the role of the disciples is also stressed. The presence--or absence--of the disciples is one of the determining features of the symmetrical pattern. The disciples are involved along with Jesus in the three controversies over associating with sinners, over not observing the pious practice of fasting, and over breaking the sabbath. Thus, they are joined with Jesus in the three specific issues of the section--sin, fasting, and sabbath. Further, they are joined throughout with Jesus in his objectionable behavior in regard to eating. On the other hand, they do not participate in Jesus' objectionable healing behavior: they play no role in A or A'.

---

[50] See above, pp. 152-159. Budesheim ("Jesus," p. 203) is correct in his observation that vv. 13-14 effect "an inclusion of the disciples at a critical point in the narration of the Jesus-tradition where they otherwise would have been only unobtrusively present." He is also correct in his further observation that "by following the narration of the conflict stories with the summary of Jesus′ activities with the disciples (3:7-12, esp. v. 7!) an emphasis on them is produced without violating the continuity of the narration" (Ibid.). Budesheim′s study of the various stages of redaction in 1:16-3:19 ("Jesus," pp. 190-206), like the foregoing rhetorical analysis, confirms the importance of the disciples′ role in 2:1-3:6. The results of the two different methodological approaches serve to confirm each other.

The rhetorical analysis, which has demonstrated an emphasis upon the role of the disciples in the Galilean controversy section, indicates that scholars studying the role of the disciples in the gospel of Mark as an avenue to understanding Mark's theology and Sitz im Leben should include a consideration of the disciples in 2:1-3:6.[51]

The present concern of this study is not on the function of the disciples in markan theology but on the significance of the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 for understanding the meaning and function of that text. Thus, the following discussion will be limited to two issues: first, the portrait of the disciples presented in 2:13-28 as a whole; and second, the question of whether the rhetorical structure sheds any light on the reason for the disciples' exclusion from Jesus' healing activity in 2:1-3:6.

The portrait of the disciples in 2:13-28. The rhetorical emphasis upon the disciples in 2:13-28 and the disciples' place in the symmetrical pattern of 2:1-3:6 suggest that the disciples are not just incidentally characters in these controversies but that the redactor of 2:13:6 is making some point about the disciples and the nature of discipleship. A closer consideration of the role of the disciples in 2:13-28 may help to illumine what that point is.

---

[51] Weeden, perhaps the foremost advocate of the role of the disciples as the means to understand Mark's theology and community, virtually ignores the role of the disciples in 2:1-3:6 in his book, Mark. However, later (in "Conflict," pp. 206-207) he does consider their role, adopting Budesheim's position.

The picture of the disciples in 2:13-28 is indeed a consistent one. The disciples, with Jesus, engage in behavior characteristic of the coming of the kingdom--they eat with outcasts, they do not fast, they ignore the sabbath requirements. The new freedom is not Jesus' alone but extends to his disciples as well.[52] Further, the disciples' participation in "kingdom" behavior brings them, like Jesus, into conflict with the Jewish opponents. It is their behavior which is questioned in C and B'.

Perhaps the most striking feature, however, of the presentation of the disciples in 2:13-28 is not their inclusion in Jesus' freedom and its consequences, but the presentation of their relationship to Jesus. Throughout the three pericopes, the disciples' dependence upon Jesus is stressed. The call of Levi to become a disciple rests solely upon the initiative of Jesus.[53] The justification for Jesus' (and by extension, the disciples') eating with outcasts is Jesus' mission to sinners. The disciples' practice of fasting or not fasting depends entirely upon the presence or absence of Jesus. The citation of the incident of David eating the showbread emphasizes the subordinate or derivate role of David's followers. The followers did not act illegally on their own account; they did so because of their association with David and because he in effect authorized them to do so. Finally, the disciples' violation of the sabbath is justified by Jesus' authority over the sabbath as Son of man (2:23-24,27-28).[54] The disciples' behavior is justified indirectly by their relationship to Jesus. Throughout 2:13-28, the subordinate or derivate role of the disciples is emphasized. Their actions depend upon the initiative and authority of Jesus.[55]

---

[52] Hultgren ("Adversaries," p. 131) views the disciples' behavior in 2:1-3:6 not as their sharing in the freedom of the kingdom but as the statement (of the collector) that the disciples are approved by God, "regardless of their inability to measure up to Pharisaic standards of religious observance." The emphasis in 2:13-28 seems rather to be on the disciples as sharers of the way of Jesus.

[53] As do the calls of the brothers in 1:16-20.

The picture of the disciples in 2:13-28 does not yet show any hint of the motif of misunderstanding or blindness found later in the gospel. That motif appears to be introduced first in 4:13 in regard to the disciples' not understanding the parable (Jesus' teaching) and in 4:40 in regard to Jesus' miraculous power over the storm. The picture presented in 2:13-28 is a positive one of the disciples responding to Jesus' initiative and unhesitatingly following in his way against the old way of Judaism.[56] In the gospel, Mark first presents the disciples' immediate response to Jesus' call (1:16-20; 2:14) and then their dependence upon Jesus' initiative and authority in their participation in the life of the coming kingdom (2:13-28). Only after these motifs have been established is the further motif of the disciples' lack of understanding introduced.

---

[54] Kolenkow ("Healing Controversy," p. 636, fn. 5) has argued that 2:28 is an inappropriate conclusion to a controversy about the disciples' behavior. On the contrary, 2:28 appears to be a continuation of the theme of the disciples' dependence upon the initiative and authority of Jesus.

[55] Budesheim ("Jesus," pp. 205, 207, 208) has argued that the consequence of the inclusion of the disciples in Jesus' controversy activity is "the exaltation of the disciples-Gestalt along with the Jesus-figure;" that in the premarkan redaction of the tradition, there is "a parallelization of the Jesus-figure and the disciples-Gestalt" and an "exaltation of the disciple in the tradition to the honor of θεῖοι ἄνδρες." At least as far as 2:13-28 is concerned, this view does not appear to be substantiated. The text emphasizes not the "exaltation" of the disciples but their subordination to Jesus, their dependence upon his initiative and authority. While Budesheim has acutely observed the prominence of the disciples in the narrative, he has paid insufficient attention to the content which describes the disciples' relationship to Jesus.

The disciples and healing in 2:1-3:6. In 2:1-3:6, the disciples participate in all aspects of Jesus' ministry except for healing. One major reason for their exclusion from healing may be seen in the order of Mark's gospel. 2:13-28 emphasizes the dependency of the disciples upon Jesus, their subordinate or derivate role. Healing, like eating, is a manifestation of the coming of the kingdom of God. But healing, more particularly, is a manifestation of Jesus' ἐξουσία from God. It is not until 3:14-15 that Jesus formally appoints the twelve and gives them authority over demons, and not until 6:7-13 that he sends the disciples out to preach and heal. Given the derivative nature of the discipleship role, the disciples' participation in healing can only follow their empowerment and sending forth by Jesus.[57]

---

[56] Several scholars have noted that 2:1-3:6 is not only a demonstration of Jesus' way over against that of the Jewish opponents (and the conflict Jesus' way aroused) but is also an implied criticism of Jewish-Christians who adhere too closely to the old way (Trocmé, *Formation*, pp. 108-109; Schweizer, *Mark*, p. 64; Kelber, *Kingdom*, pp. 18-22; Kuhn [for his collection], *Sammlungen*, pp. 83-85, 96). The disciples, however, do not appear to be implicated in this criticism, for they follow the way of Jesus. Even in 2:18-22, in which the fasting after Jesus' death may well reflect historically a return to Jewish praxis, the text does not imply any criticism of the disciples who react appropriately to the presence/absence or death of Jesus. Insofar as 2:1-3:6 may be a markan polemic against his Jewish Christian opponents, it is the opponents not the disciples who represent the Jewish Christians.

The life versus death theme brought out by the symmetrical structure of 2:1-3:6 may provide an additional reason for the exclusion of the disciples from A and A'. In A and A', Jesus triumphantly accomplishes resurrection-type miracles. Also in A and A', the threat of death hangs most closely over Jesus--in the potential charge of blasphemy in 2:6, and in the opponents watching Jesus to make a legal charge against him, and then plotting to destroy him in 3:2,6. But the possibility or inevitability of death for Jesus is not an inevitability or necessity for the disciples.[58] Indeed, in the central pericope of the concentric structure, the debate about fasting in which Jesus alludes to his coming death (2:20), the disciples are explicitly excluded from the death which will overtake Jesus. They remain to fast after the bridegroom has been taken away. The confrontation of the way of life and death revealed in 2:1-3:6 is first of all a confrontation between Jesus, whom the reader knows to be the Christ and Son of God (1:1,11), and his opponents. By excluding the disciples from A and A', where the conflict is most evident, and affirming their continued existence after the conflict culminates in Jesus' death in C, the redactor of 2:1-3:6 has emphasized for the reader the focus of the life/death theme upon the person of Jesus *and* the fact that the disciples, the adherents of Jesus, will not be destroyed in this confrontation of life and death.[59]

---

[57] Another reason for the exclusion of the disciples from healing is that fact that 2:1-12 (A) deals with forgiveness of sins. Unlike healing in general, forgiveness remains the prerogative of Jesus alone. Even after Jesus' death, forgiveness is mediated "in the name of Jesus" or "through" him (Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18; Col 1:14).

[58] For the position that Jesus is arguing against suffering as a means to end-time glory for the disciples, see Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," pp. 160-165. See also Dewey, Disciples, pp. 81-94.

Summary

The results of the second reading confirm and extend the results of the first reading. The rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 is indeed elegant, showing the hand of a redactor skilled in structuring, interrelating and developing his material. Both the linear pattern, the introduction of motifs in 2:1-12, their development in the succeeding pericopes and climax in 3:1-6, and the elaborate concentric and chiastic pattern of 2:1-3:6 reveal the work of a redactor skilled in the art of narrative.

Awareness of the literary pattern helps the reader to understand and appreciate the text. The pattern helps to explain the meaning and function of individual elements of the text such as the relation of 2:25-26 to 2:13-17, and the role of the Son of man sayings in 2:10 and 28. The pattern helps to bring out the meaning and emphases of the text as a whole: the fundamental nature of the conflict between Jesus and his opponents, the role of healing and eating, the theme of life and death, and the nature of the discipleship role. The study of rhetorical structure, then, not only enriches the reader's experience of the text, but is a useful aid to the redaction critic in determining the theology of the text.

---

[59] Later in the gospel, acceptance or rejection of Jesus is presented as an ultimate life or death matter for the individual (8:34-9:1). However, unlike 2:1-3:6, it is not a matter of confrontation of the powers of life and death, but a matter of choice for the individual--whether to become a disciple or not.

The rhetorical analysis also has important implications for the methodology of form and redaction criticism. The multiple interrelationships of the text indicate that the critic, who attempts to determine the tradition history and redaction of a pericope, may not restrict his study to the individual pericope. He must also consider the larger rhetorical unit of which the pericope is a part, since many details of the pericope may be the result of modification of tradition to fit the larger structure. For example, the extensive parallelism of A and A′ (2:1-12; 3:1-6) suggests that one or both pericopes were modified (or even composed) in order to make the two pericopes parallel. The elaborate interconnections of A with B (2:1-12,13-17), B with B′ (2:13-17,23-28), and B′ with A′ (2:23-28; 3:1-6) show that the individual traditions must have been redacted to fit their place in the larger structure. For example, the fact that both B and B′ end with a general proverb followed by a christological saying may be due not to the individual development of the separate pericopes but to the redactional activity of the compiler of 2:1-3:6. Thus, rhetorical criticism is not only a useful approach in its own right to elucidate the meaning of a text, but also an additional tool for determining the tradition history and redaction of a text.

CHAPTER V

CONCENTRIC STRUCTURE IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

In the previous chapter, after the rhetorical analysis of Mark 2:1-3:6, the linear and the concentric patterns were discussed from the point of view of their contribution to understanding the meaning or theology of 2:1-3:6. In this chapter, the focus of attention will be on literary structure itself. For the recognition of the symmetrical parallelism or concentric structure to be found in Mark 2:1-3:6 raises two questions requiring consideration. First, if the concentric structure in 2:1-3:6 is as well-defined and elegant as has been argued, should not the structure be a commonplace of Biblical exegesis? Second, is 2:1-3:6 an isolated occurrence of symmetrical patterning or rhythm in Mark, or does it occur elsewhere, and frequently enough, so that it may be considered one of Mark's literary techniques? Before turning to these two questions, it seems useful to specify more systematically the criteria employed in identifying symmetrical patterns, as seen in 2:1-3:6.

Criteria for Identifying Concentric Patterns

In chapter one, it was observed that content and/or word repetition were the usual means employed for identifying symmetrical patterns. It was suggested that for the synoptic material, at least, parallelism of form provided an additional criterion. It was stated that the more congruent symmetries a passage contains, the surer one is that the pattern is one which exists in the text rather than one imposed by the interpreter.[1] The rhetorical analysis of 2:1-3:6 indeed disclosed multiple congruent parallelisms based on content, form, and word repetition. The following is a more detailed analysis of the criteria actually used in identifying the concentric pattern of Mark 2:1-3:6.[2] The same types of criteria, of course, may be used to identify any rhetorical pattern, whether linear, repetitive, concentric --or, for that matter, absence of any clear rhetorical pattern.

Content. Parallelisms of content varied from the very general (Jesus heals, some reference to eating) to the highly specific (in each healing, Jesus restores a part of a man's body by means of his word alone). The parallelism may be synonymous or antithetic--e.g., the contrast of eating vs. fasting or the reaction of the crowd to Jesus' healing in 2:12 and of the opponents in 3:6.

Two particular types of content parallelism deserve special mention for their usefulness in identifying structure: setting and character roles. Setting includes indications of time and place and generally occurs at the beginning of a pericope. In 2:1-3:6, place indications predominate. Character roles, as has been seen, may be filled by the same person or group (e.g., Jesus or the disciples) or by different ones in turn (e.g., the two disabled men, or the sequence of opponents). The narrative or internal audience is a specific character role.

---

[1] See above, pp. 63-64.

[2] David J. Clark ("Criteria for Identifying Chiasm," Linguistica Biblica 35 [1975] 63-66) classifies and attempts to give some "linguistic precision" to the criteria I employed in my article, "Structure," (1973). I have found his discussion helpful in clarifying my own criteria--sometimes in agreement, sometimes in disagreement with Clark.

In using content parallels for identification of rhetorical patterns, two methodological questions appear relevant. First, is the content parallel objective--that is, can most readers readily agree that the parallel really exists in the text? Second, how does one establish the relative importance for identifying structure of various, sometimes noncongruent, parallels of differing specificity and salience? The second, while subject to the guideline of multiple congruent parallels, remains dependent upon the literary sensitivity--and theological dispositions--of the rhetorical critic. A rhetorical analysis may be said to be successful to the degree that it sheds light on the understanding of the text. The first issue is discussed below.

Content parallels involve varying degrees of abstraction.[3] To say that in the healings in 2:1-12 and 3:1-6, Jesus restores formerly handicapped parts of the body and employs the verb, ἐγείρω, is descriptive. It reflects manifest content. To call these two healings "resurrection-type" healings is to employ a classification accepted by some scholars, not one self-evidently contained in the text. To point out that blasphemy in A and healing on the sabbath in A′ are both potentially capital charges is valid enough, based on our knowledge of the gospel of Mark, and the Judaism and Christianity of the time. But it is to generalize beyond what is clearly stated in the text. To argue on the basis of the above information (plus the manifest content of 3:1-6) that both A and A′ reflect the theme of death vs. life/resurrection is to move beyond a description of manifest content to an interpretation of the text. All of the above statements are, in my opinion, helpful for understanding the text.

---

[3] The phrase is from Clark ("Criteria," p. 65). The examples and methodological conclusions are mine.

However, for the purposes of identifying a rhetorical structure, it seems most objective and most subject to control to limit the parallels used to those which are clearly descriptions of manifest content or widely acceptable abstractions from manifest content. The death/resurrection theme should not be used to help establish structure. Indeed, the argument at that point has shifted from the first stage, the use of content to identify pattern, to the second stage, the use of pattern to illumine the meaning of the content. The second stage is indeed the aim of the rhetorical enterprise. Methodologically, however, the two phases should be kept as separate as possible.

Form. Like content parallels, formal parallels may be very general (pronouncement story, healing controversy) or quite specific (a general or secular proverb, a christological saying). There is an obvious overlap with content: a healing controversy contains the subjects of healing and conflict; a christological saying says something about Jesus. Form, however, provides a different perspective from content for viewing the text, and one which may more readily be classifiable. Scholars may argue over whether the disciples in Mark 2:23-24 are making way for Jesus or are gathering food; they can, however, agree that the action is the "objectionable behavior" which is the starting point of the controversy apophthegm.

In the rhetorical analysis of the individual pericopes of the Galilean controversy section, the internal structure of each of the pericopes was found to differ in various ways from the typical or basic "structure" of the controversy form. In the second reading of the section as a whole, various parallels were noted between the internal structure of one pericope and another, parallels that cannot be attributed to form-critical similarity. For example, both healing controversies, A and A′, not only were of the formal type with the healing at the end, but both had the unusual structural pattern of healing, address to opponents, healing. The apophethegms B and B′ each climaxed not with a single logion but with a double saying of Jesus, a general proverb followed by a christological or "I" saying. Thus, in addition to parallelisms of form-critical classification, the parallels found between the structures of individual pericopes were a helpful tool in identifying the overall structure of the section.

Word repetition. The different types of word repetition were spelled out in chapter one.[4] Here the question is, how does one evaluate whether or not an instance or word repetition is significant or merely coincidental.[5] Clark, in trying to define criteria for determining the "variable significance" of hook words, has written as follows:

---

[4] See above, pp. 52-54.

> Rarer words are more significant than common words. Identical forms are more significant than similar forms. The same word class is more significant than different word classes formed from the same root. Identical roots are more significant than suppletive roots.[6]

What Clark writes about the infrequency of a repeated word and about the degree of verbal identity would seem generally applicable.[7] Other factors, however, also need to be considered. A series of words may constitute a hook phrase even if the individual words are frequent (e.g., καὶ εἰσελθῶν/εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰσ 2:1, 3:1; λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ 3:3,5). Perhaps the most important factors are how the repeated words function in their context and where they occur in the overall pattern. Mourlon Beernaert writes:

> Il s'agit d'y mettre surtout en valeur les multiples relations et les dépendances internes....Notre attention se portera donc sur un ensemble d'indices relevés dans le texte considéré comme un tout, reconnaissant volontiers que des détails isolés de l'analyse, pris en eux-mêmes, n'ont pas grande valeur et peuvent souvent être refusés: cela seul a du poids qui est

---

[5] For example, is word repetition found in pericope introductory formulas a structural indicator or merely coincidental? See above, p.

[6] "Criteria," p. 65.

[7] Some variations of word form may be required by the syntax of a sentence; some may reflect the writer's desire for variety.

> vérifié par l'ensemble du passage et confirmé par la convergence des indices.[8]

Thus both Mourlon Beernaert and I cite "heart" in 2:6,8 and 3:5 as a hook word supporting the parallelism of A and A'.[9] In each case, the word is used in the central debate with Jesus' opponents. And neither of us (nor Clark) has cited οὐδέποτε, in 2:12 and 25, the first occurrence at the end of A, in the crowd's acclamation of Jesus, and the second in the middle of B', used as an interrogative, in Jesus' question to his opponents. The usages are not sufficiently parallel, even though the word is rare--these are its only occurrences in Mark. The occurrence of word repetition is not necessarily in itself meaningful.

Summary. What is meaningful or significant is the existence of multiple congruent parallelisms, of content, or form-critical classification, of structure, and of word repetition. In the words of Mourlon Beernaert, "La structure litteraire qui permet de synthetiser le plus grand nombre d'elements textuels demontre par la meme sa richesse et sa fecondite,"[10] or in the words of Clark, "As with the force of catchwords, so with the chiastic criteria as a whole, *the impact is cumulative*."[11]

The identification of a symmetrical pattern, then, is in part objective. Content parallels, parallels of form and structure, word repetitions, may be demonstrated in the text. The pattern formed by multiple congruent parallels may be described and diagrammed. The recognition of the symmetrical structure, however, is in part subjective as well. The interpretation of the parallels, the significance (if any) laid upon them, the awareness of the cumulative effect, is a matter for the discretion and judgment of the literary critic. The recognition is in part dependent upon the aural sensitivity of the audience.

---

[8] "Jésus controversé," p. 132. [9] Ibid., p. 139.

[10] Ibid., p. 132. [11] "Criteria," p. 66.

Recognition of Mark 2:1-3:6 as a Symmetrical Pattern

Recognition in contemporary scholarship

The symmetrical pattern of Mark 2:1-3:6 is sufficiently marked that it has come increasingly to be recognized by twentieth century scholars, even with our heritage and training in strictly linear, logical thinking. That the last two pericopes both concern sabbath law has probably always been self-evident. It was stressed by J. Weiss in 1903[12] and Bacon in 1909.[13] Sundwall in 1934 pointed out that the first two controversies, like the last two, formed a pair, this time connected by the concern with sin.[14] Farrer in

---

[12] Evangelium, p. 160. [13] Beginnings, p. 24.

[14] Zusammensetzung, p. 16. Lohmeyer (Markus, p. 49) viewed Mk 2:1-17 as three units dealing with sin.

1951 noted that the middle three controversies all dealt with eating.[15] Rudolf Grob in 1965 appears to have been the first to call attention to the striking similarities between the first and last controversy stories: both are healings, in both Jesus speaks while the opponents remain silent, in both Jesus commands the man to rise, in both Jesus stands alone facing his opponents, while in the three middle ones the disciples are a part.[16] Grob also notes some content connections between each two successive controversies.

Giuseppe G. Gamba in 1966 was the first scholar to recognize a symmetrical pattern in Mark 2:1-3:6.[17] He is concerned to demonstrate that the synoptic gospels are literary writings following the ancient rhetorical rules of dispositio or arrangement.[18] In 2:1-3:6, Gamba focuses on the content pattern: sin-fasting-sabbath, 2:1-17, 18-22, 23-3:6. He notes the continuity in content between 2:1-12 and 13-17 and between 2:23-28 and 3:1-6, and the formal parallels between 2:1-12 and 3:1-6. Each contains a miracle and a narrative conclusion (audience reaction), while the middle three pericopes end abruptly with the words of Jesus.[19]

---

[15] Mark, pp. 71-72. [16] Einführung, pp. 37-38.

[17] "Considerazioni," p. 327-331. Gamba calls his structure chiastic, although techncally the term does not apply to it: he views four border scenes related to each other and all leading to the center (Ibid., p. 330).

[18] Ibid., pp. 324, 349. Indeed his structural outline of Mk 2:1-3:6 is a short prologue to his schematic outline or arrangement of Mk 2:1-12 into two and three-part clause divisions.

[19] Gamba also cites as part of the concentric structure the reversal

Gamba does not observe the congruent concentric pattern of healing-eating-healing, 2:1-12, 13-28; 3:1-6, in which the disciples participate in the eating but not in the healing. Gamba ignores the element of conflict or controversy in interpreting the entire section. He sees no linear or climactic development. Thus Gamba misses some major rhetorical features of the section. Nonetheless, by viewing it from the point of view of arrangement and noting just a few of the content and structure parallels, he became aware of the symmetrical pattern.

Then, in 1973, Mourlon Beernaert[20] and I[21] presented independently of each other somewhat different proposed concentric patterns for Mark 2:1-3:6. Mourlon Beernaert's method, similar to mine, has already been cited in the discussion on criteria above: he seeks to determine pattern on the basis of the convergence of multiple indices of textual elements. His actual analysis employs content parallels and word repetition, but not formal or structural indices.

Mourlon Beernaert has stated his purpose as follows:

---

of the role of Jesus and the disciples in 2:13-17 and 23-28. In the first, the disciples are questioned about Jesus; in the second, Jesus is questioned about the disciples. I would argue that this shift fits into the linear climactic development of the heightening of opposition. However, the reversal may be part of the parallel structure, or it may be the accidental consequence of bringing the disciples into the foreground in 2:13-28 (see above, pp. 222-227).

[20] "Jésus controversé," pp.129-149.

[21] "Structure," pp. 394-401. My structure is essentially that presented above in chapter four, pp. 195-207.

> L'effort de notre étude viserait à dégager la structure à la fois littéraire et théologique de l'ensemble de ce passage de Marc (2,1-3,6).[22]

> Nous sommes invités...à examiner si ces controverses ne se conditionnent pas l'une l'autre dans leur composition littéraire et théologique.[23]

Thus, Mourlon Beernaert emphasizes the identity of the literary and theological structure while I would argue that the literary structure is an avenue toward understanding theological meaning.

Mourlon Beernaert summarizes his concentric structure as follows (my pericope letters are given in the left margin for comparison):[24]

A	W	2:1-9	Healing by Jesus, silence of opponents ("And entering again," "heart")
	X	2:10-12	Declaration on the Son of man (authority)
B	Y	2:13-17	Action of Jesus, reaction of the disciples ("eat," "have need")
C	Z	2:18-22	Sayings of Jesus on the bridegroom and newness
B′	Y′	2:23-26	Action of disciples, reaction to Jesus ("eat," "have need")
	X′	2:27-28	Declaration on the Son of man (lord)
A′	W′	3:1-6	Healing by Jesus, silence of opponents ("And he entered again," "heart")

---

[22] Mourlon Beernaert, "Jésus controversé," p. 130.

[23] Ibid., p. 131.

[24] The following is virtually a translation of Mourlon Beernaert's summary ("Jésus controversé," p. 141). I have added additional hook words which he cites on pp. 138-140, and I have relettered his structure W, X, Y,... in order to avoid confusion with mine.

Mourlon Beernaert's insistence on the identity of the theological and literary structure[25] appears to be the reason that his structure deviates from Gamba's and mine. In studying 2:1-3:6, he asks the question, "*ce qui est contesté* dans la personne de Jésus,"[26] and focuses on the most striking christological feature of the section, the Son of man sayings. "La double affirmation sur l'autorité du Fils de l'Homme, assez solennelle dans le récit,...peut nous amener à une nouvelle lecture du passage."[27] Using the two sayings as his starting points, he then builds his structure around them: "Cette double déclaration nous invite à être attentifs à d'autres parallélismes littéraires, de manière à percevoir progressivement l'architecture globale du texte."[28]

Placing the two Son of man sayings in symmetrical parallelism (X and X') results in breaking the first and fourth pericopes into two parts each, thereby obliterating the formal and structural parallels between the two healing miracles, the first and last pericopes, and between the general proverbs and christological sayings climaxing the second and fourth pericopes.

---

[25] A similar insistence on the oneness of the theological and literary structure may be found in other studies on markan structure by Mourlon Beernaert and his associates. See D. Dideberg & P. Mourlon Beernaert, "Jésus vint en Galilée," *NRT* 98 (1976) 306; Radermakers, "L'évangile de Marc. Structure et théologie," *L'évangile selon Marc. Tradition et Rédaction*, ed. M. Sabbe (BETL 34; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1974), p. 221, passim; Mourlon Beernaert, "Structure littéraire et lecture théologique de Marc 14,17-52," ibid., p. 266.

[26] "Jésus controversé," p. 129.

[27] Ibid., p. 138.

[28] Ibid., p. 139. The fact that even beginning with the two Son of man sayings, Mourlon Beernaert still arrives at a concentric pattern is attributable to the large number of congruent parallels in 2:1-3:6.

In so doing, Mourlon Beernaert has lost much of the richness the structure of the five stories helps bring out. He has obscured the healing-eating-healing pattern, the role of the disciples, and the life-death theme of the first and last pericopes. He has destroyed the chiastic relationship of the first two and last two pericopes: A B : B′ A′. Rather he focuses on 2:18-22, the center, hinge, or pivot, "qui donne la clef de l′ensemble,"[29] and how it helps to elucidate the entire controversy section.[30] Mourlon Beernaert tends to consider the center of a concentric structure the most important part by definition.[31] Since his structure obscures the pattern among the four outside pericopes, it gives Mourlon Beernaert no reason to modify his concentration upon the center as the key to understanding.

Thus, Mourlon Beernaert′s method for identifying a structure (concentric or otherwise) suggests various reflections on adequate criteria. First, to assume the identity of theology and literary structure is to invite definition of a literary pattern around its theological content--in this case the Son of man sayings. If literary/rhetorical patterns are to be a useful means of bringing out the meaning or theology of a passage, then the literary pattern should be determined as far as possible by literary/rhetorical means alone. The argumentation should not be more circular than it need be.

---

[29] Ibid., p. 133. [30] Ibid., pp. 142, 144.

[31] Ibid., p. 141.

Second, formal and structural parallels should be included along with content and word repetition among the criteria for identifying symmetrical (or other) patterns. This does not mean that every pattern with a symmetrical rhythm will necessarily contain marked formal or structural parallels. It does mean that a rhetorical critic must analyze a passage for such parallels and take them into account. When they do exist, they provide an important control on the fancies of any literary/rhetorical critic as well as considerable support for (or against) a given structure.

At minimum, the overall structure, "l′architecture globale," should not conflict with the literary structure of the individual parts of the whole. In breaking 2:10-12 from 2:1-9, Mourlon Beernaert has separated Jesus′ final statement to the opponents from the interposition which it climaxes, and associated it with the healing. Given all the rhetorical clues provided in 2:1-12,[32] it seems improbable that either the composer/redactor intended or the audience would hear a break before v. 10.

Finally, insofar as a rhetorical pattern is something which may sensed or felt (on some level) by the audience,[33] then the rhetorical pattern must respect the major literary divisions contained within it--that is, the individual episode or pericope. For it is the individual periocpe or story which most immediately stands out as a unit. A listener is not likely to be aware (consciously or unconsciously) of a complex pattern or higher level structure which conflicts with--rather than builds upon--the obvious aural units, as Mourlon Beernaert's three-part divisions of 2:1-17 and 2:23-3:6 do.[34]

---

[32] See above, pp. 120-123.

[33] On the question of audience recognition, see Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 79-81.

Recognition in the first century

If symmetrical patterning is truly a literary structure heard consciously or unconsciously by at least some of Mark's audience, it is more important to be able to demonstrate that first century people were aware of such patterns than that twentieth century biblical scholars are. One way to approach the question of audience awareness is to look at how Matthew and Luke have employed the material from Mark 2:1-3:6, to see if it can be determined if they recognized the symmetrical pattern.[35]

---

[34] Mourlon Beernaert in his analysis does respect the natural aural subdivisions of 2:1-3:6, treating it either as five stories showing dramatic conflict or as a three-part pattern of sin and sabbath surrounding the central section. He ignores his seven-part structure in his interpretation.

[35] The following discussion assumes the priority of Mark. On the question of the relationship of Mk 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 and Jn 5, see above, pp. 94-96.

Matthew certainly did not retain Mark′s structure. The first three controversy pericopes are to be found in Mt 9:1-17, and the last two not until 12:1-14. The content of the last two, the sabbath pericopes, are modified to include halakhic-type arguments.[36] Nonetheless, there is some evidence that Matthew may have recognized the concentric pattern--or at least the parallelism of pericopes B and B′, eating with tax collectors and sinners and plucking grain on the sabbath. For in each pericope, just before the final christological saying, he inserts the quotation from Hosea 6:6: "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice." In 9:13 (B) he introduces it with the phrase, "Go and learn what this means." In 12:7 (B′), he introduces it with the accusation: "And if you had known what this means...you would not have condemned the guiltless." And in both cases, the final christological saying is connected by means of the conjunction, γάρ. These are the only two citations of Hosea 6:6 in Matthew. The connection between the quote and its context is not very clear in either instance.[37] It would seem more probable that Matthew′s recognition of the parallelism of B and B′ in Mark lies behind his double insertion of the quote in the same place than that the parallel insertion is the result of chance.

The evidence that Luke recognized and deliberately kept Mark′s concentric structure is virtually conclusive. He keeps the section intact; he keeps the large majority of Mark's parallels of content, hook words, form and structure; and, most convincing, he has added several additional parallels.

---

[36] Daube, New Testament.

[37] Carlston, Parables, p. 111; Robert Banks, Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition (SNTSMS 28; London: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 109, 117-118.

The five controversy apophthegms, in Mark's order, are found in Luke 5:17-6:11, near the beginning of Jesus' public ministry in Luke's gospel. Like Mark, Luke has set the controversies into a frame--but a different frame from Mark's. Instead of Mark's picture ofJesus out in the country with people streaming to him from everywhere (Mk 1:45; 3:7-8), Luke pictures Jesus in the country by himself, praying:

> Lk 5:16 αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσευχόμενος.
>
> Lk 6:12 'Εγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι, καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύν ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ.

The two parts of Luke's frame may be derived from Mark, Luke 5:16 from Mark 1:35, and Luke 6:12 from Mark 6:46, neither of which Luke uses in its markan context. Whatever the source, Luke has maintained the device of a frame around the five conflicts, while changing the content of the frame.

Luke extends the parallelism of content and hook words in the two healing controversies, A and A' (Lk 5:17-26; 6:6-11),[38] often picking up a word or phrase from one of the two pericopes and incorporating it into the other.

---

[38] Since Luke retains Mark's concentric structure, it seems permissible to refer to Luke's pericopes by the same letters used to refer to Mark's. A = Lk 5:17-26; B = 5:27-32; C = 5:33-39; B' = 6:1-5; and A' = 6:6-11.

(1) In A, Luke changes the introduction from Mark's "Jesus was speaking the word" to Jesus "was teaching." In A′, Luke adds that Jesus taught (ἦν διδάσκων, διδάσκειν, Lk 5:16; 6:6).

(2) In Mark, in A, the handicapped man is always referred to as the paralytic, while in A′, he is referred to as the man (ἄνθρωπος) having or with a withered arm (Mk 2:3,4,5,9,10; 3:1,3,5). Luke keeps Mark's use of ἄνθρωπος in A′, and inserts it into A, introducing the paralytic first as "the man who" (Lk 6:6; 5:18[20]).

(3) Luke also makes the description of the opponents more parallel: in A and A′ they are described as οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι.[39] In both instances, not just in A, Jesus knows, τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν (Lk 5:21, 22; 6:7,8).

(4) In both A and A′, Luke keeps the basic structure of address to the handicapped man, address to the opponents, address to the handicapped man. Although he does not repeat τῷ παραλυτικῷ/τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ in the addresses to the man in need of healing, he does introduce Jesus' address with εἶπεν in all four instances (Lk 5:20,24; 6:8,10).

(5) Unlike Matthew, who drops Mark's awkward expression, ἔγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον from the concluding healing, Luke modifies Mark's wording in A′ to make it smoother Greek and smoother narrative, and adds some of the

---

[39] The combination and order "scribes and Pharisees" does not appear to be a set formula in Luke. He uses it in these two instances and 11:53; he uses "Pharisees and scribes" twice, in 5:30 and 15:2; he uses "Pharisees and lawyers" twice, 5:17 and 7:30; and "lawyers and Pharisees" once, 14:3.

terminology into A. A′ in Luke reads, ἔγειρε καὶ στῆθι εἰς τὸ μέσον· καὶ ἀναστὰς ἔστη (Lk 6:8). Luke adds εἰς τὸ μέσον to A, in 5:19, as the description of where the men lowered the paralytic.[40] In both A and A′, the handicapped man is placed in the middle. And in A, after Jesus commands the paralytic, ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας Immediately he ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν (5:25). In both A and A′, Luke has the command, ἔγειρε, and the response, ἀναστὰς.

(6) Finally, Luke emphasizes the (antithetical) parallelism of the audience response to the two healings by the use of a hook word: in A, ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου; in A′, ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας (5:26; 6:11). Πίμπλημι is used thirteen times in Luke, but only in these two instances and 4:28 in describing audience reaction.[41]

On the other hand, Luke has deleted Mark′s hook words και εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς and καρδία. These two deletions seem more than offset by the number and clarity of the parallels Luke has added to A and A′. One or two of Luke′s changes or additions might possibly be attributed to consistent stylistic preference, but the sheer number of them indicates recognition--and extension--of Mark′s parallelism between the two healing controversies.

That Luke recognized not just the parallelism of A and A′ but a symmetrical pattern in the whole of Mark 2:1-3:6 may be seen in two significant changes Luke makes in stories B, C, and B′. In the first place, he makes the roles of the opponents, disciples, and Jesus exactly parallel in B and B′. In each instance the opponents ask the disciples about their own behavior.[42] In each case, Jesus formally answers the opponents:

---

[40] Luke uses εἰς τὸ μέσον elsewhere only in 4:35, in the sabbath exorcism which has many connections to A and A′.

[41] Three of the nine uses in Acts also describe audience reaction (Acts 3:10; 5:17; 13:45).

B 5:31 ϰαὶ ἀποϰριϑεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς

B′ 6:3 ϰαὶ ἀποϰριϑεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς

The word order of πρὸς αὐτούς and ὁ Ἰησοῦς is reversed (chiastic); otherwise the two clauses are identical.

Secondly, Luke makes more explicit than Mark the theme of eating which connects the three middle pericopes.[43] In B, the opponents ask the disciples, Διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν ϰαὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσϑίετε ϰαὶ πίνετε; in C, the opponents ask Jesus, why the disciples of John and the Pharisees fast, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσϑίουσιν ϰαὶ πίνουσιν; finally in B′, the disciples pluck ϰαὶ ἤσϑιον τοὺς στάχυας (5:30,33; 6:1). The content is present in Mark--ἐσϑιεῖν, νηστεύειν and φαγεῖν. Luke adds the aural cue by the use of "eat" from the root ἐσϑίω in all three pericopes, and "drink" in B and C.[44] Luke, for one, recognized

---

[42] The verbs in the opponents′ questions are 2nd person plural.

[43] Luke also maintans the content parallels of sin in A and B, and sabbath in B′ and A′, although the hook words are not as exact parallels as in Mark.

[44] Luke also deletes two of Mark′s parallels between B and B′. He omits "the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath" in B′, thus removing the structural parallelism of general proverb followed by christological saying climaxing B and B′. He drops the hook word, "have need," from B′. These seem minor compared to the parallelism of character roles in B and B′, and the emphasis on eating.

Mark's concentric structure.

Two further comments may be made about Luke's narrative technique in comparison to Mark's in the controversy section as a whole. First, Luke considerably weakens Mark's linear or climactic development of the increasing level of opposition to Jesus. He does not present a sequence of opponents, questioning first the disciples and then Jesus directly. The conclusion does not present a plot to kill Jesus, but merely a discussion about what to do to Jesus (6:11).[45]

On the other hand, Luke has given the passage the impression of linear continuity by smoothing out some of the geographical and chronological sequence of the narrative.[46] Luke explicitly makes Levi the giver of the banquet in B (Lk 5:29). The discussion over fasting in C is presented as a continuation of the converstaion at Levi's banquet (5:33). The healing in the synagogue is on a different sabbath from the incident of the grain plucking. Thus, in Luke as well as Mark, a linear movement is maintained as well as a clearly concentric pattern.

Other Concentric Structures in the Gospel of Mark

The second question raised by the structural pattern of Mark

---

[45] Since Luke has already described an attempt to throw Jesus headlong off the brow of a hill (4:29), it would not seem that Luke tones down the conclusion to the controversy section in order to moderate Mark's account of opposition to Jesus so early in his ministry. The omission of the death plot in Luke's conclusion does, however, weaken the life/death theme found in Mark.

[46] Thus Dibelius ("Structure," p. 154) writes, "Luke was the first to work them into a real unity."

2:1-3:6 was whether such an extended concentric rhythm was an isolated occurrence in the gospel of Mark or whether the technique occurs elsewhere, and frequently enough, so that it may be considered one of Mark's compositional techniques. The answer would appear to be the latter. Although scholars have yet to study much of the gospel of Mark from a rhetorical perspective, they have already proposed extended symmetrical or chiastic patterns in chapters 1, 3, 4, 8-9, 13, and 15.[47]

Specifically, D. Dideberg and P. Mourlon Beernaert have suggested a seven-part (A B C D C′ B′ A′) structure for 1:21-45.[48] Clark has suggested a five-part structure for 1:20-2:12 which overlaps and parallels the five-part structure of 2:1-3:6.[49] Jan Lambrecht has proposed that 3:20-35 is a five-part concentric structure, in which the middle section, C, is itself a ring composition, a b a′.[50] Lambrecht has also suggested that 4:1-34 has a five-part concentric pattern, with the second and third parts each containing a ring composition.[51] Rene Lafontaine and Mourlon Beernaert have argued that 8:27-9:13 has a seven-part concentric pattern, in which the middle section, D, is a six-member chiasm (8:34-9:1).[52] Lambrecht proposes that the apocalyptic discourse (13:5b-37) is a ring composition, in which both A and A′ have five-part symmetrical patterns.[53] Ernest R. Martinez has recognized a thirteen-part chiastic or concentric ordering of the account of the death of Jesus in 15:29-41.[54]

---

[47] In addition to the passages enumerated below, Jean Radermakers (Bonne nouvelle, passim) outlines many other markan sections in a concentric pattern. Some of his structures seem forced, with inadequate attention to form and to the natural episodic divisions of the narrative.

[48] "Jésus vint," pp. 306-323.

[49] "Criteria," pp. 66-71.

[50] Marcus Interpretator: Stijl en Boodschap in Mc 3,20-4,34. (Brugge-Utrecht: Desclée de Brouwer, 1969), pp. 74-85, 132.

[51] Ibid., pp. 111-124, 133-134.

A systematic rhetorical analysis of the entire gospel of Mark for extended concentric patterns is clearly beyond the scope of a single study. Even a detailed review and evaluation of the individual studies cited in the previous paragraph would occupy many pages. Therefore, the following analysis will be limited to a consideration of three texts: Mark 1:1-8; 4:1-34, and 11-12. The first two passages have been selected to demonstrate that concentric and chiastic patterns are employed elsewhere in Mark, and to suggest some of the variations of the technique. The third selection, Mark 11-12, is the discussion of the Jerusalem public debate material. Here it will be argued that Mark has employed the technique of symmetrical rhythm to organize some of the material.

---

[52] "Structure de Marc, 8,27-9,13," pp. 543-561.

[53] "La structure de Mc. XIII," pp. 141-164. The article is a slight modification and abbreviation of the third chapter of his dissertation, Die Redaktion des Markus Apokalypse (AnBi 28; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967).

[54] The Gospel Accounts of the Death of Jesus (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1970), pp. 39-42.

Mark 1:1-8

Mark 1:1-8 is, of course, part of a larger rhetorical unit, the prologue of the gospel, 1:1-15. The entire prologue is delimited by the use of the inclusio, εὐαγγέλιον .[55] The prologue falls into two parts, vv. 1-8, concerned with John, the forerunner; and vv. 9-15, concerned with Jesus. The second part, vv. 9-15, is marked off by its own inclusio:

v. 9 ἦλθεν 'Ιησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας
v. 14 ἦλθεν ὁ 'Ιησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν

Further, the conclusion of the first part, John's preaching concerning the coming of Jesus (vv. 7-8), parallels the conclusion of the second part, Jesus' preaching concerning the coming of the Kingdom of God (vv. 14-15). The two parts are also closely interrelated by extensive and varied use of word repetitions (e.g., ἡ ἔρημος, βαπτίζω/βάπτισμα, πνεῦμα, κηρύσσω, μετανοέω/μετάνοια, ἄγγελόν/ἄγγελοι.) A full rhetorical analysis of Mark 1:1-15 would be extensive indeed. The following analysis, however, will be restricted to the elements of symmetrical rhythm and chiasm in vv. 1-8.

The text of 1:1-8 may be laid out structurally as follows:

---

[55] For the argument that the prologue consists of vv. 1-15, with εὐαγγέλιον as an inclusio, see Keck, "Introduction." See also Lamarche, "Commencement de l'évangile de Jésus, Christ, Fils de Dieu (Mc 1,1)" NRT 92 (1970) 1035.

A 1 'Αρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου 'Ιησοῦ Χριστου [υἱοῦ θεοῦ].
2 Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ 'Ησαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ,

B 'Ιδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,
ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου·
3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,
'Ετοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου,
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτου--

C 4 ἐγένετο 'Ιωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.
5 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ 'Ιουδαία χώρα
καὶ οἱ 'Ιεροσολυμῖται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ
ἐν τῷ 'Ιορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

B' 6 καὶ ἦν ὁ 'Ιωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου
καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐσθίων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

A' 7 καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων, Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου,
οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ·
8 ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

The symmetrical rhythm is indicated by the content. A and A′ concern Jesus, the beginning of the gospel of Jesus (v. 1), and John′s preaching concerning his coming (vv. 7-8). The middle parts, B, C, and B′ are concerned only with John the Baptist. B and B′, one an Old Testament quotation and the other containing an Old Testament allusion, both point beyond John to his significance in salvation history. C, on the other hand, describes John′s earthly activity.

C itself has a symmetrical rhythm with a verbal chiasm in the middle. First, John preaches *baptism* for the forgiveness of *sins*. Then people come to him, *πᾶσα ἡ 'Ιουδαία* χώρα καὶ *οἱ 'Ιεροσολυμῖται πάντες*.[56] Finally, the people are *baptized*, confessing their *sins*.

---

[56] Noted by Zerwick, *Markus Stil*, p. 125.

Verses 4-8 could also be viewed rhetorically as follows:

v. 4: A summary: John baptizes and preaches

v. 5: John's baptizing activity

v. 6: Description of John

vv. 7-8: John's preaching activity

Such a view seems less satisfactory than the structure proposed earlier. First, it breaks the symmetrical unity of vv. 4-5. Second, the preachings of v. 4 and vv. 7-8 are not related in content, whereas v. 4 relates to v. 5b, and vv. 7-8 relate to v. 1 and vv. 14-15. Lastly, the placing of v. 6 makes no particular sense or logic in this rhetorical arrangement, while it does in the one proposed first.

Verse 6, B', is on the surface a description of John. It is also an allusion to 2 Kings 1:8, where a man is described to the king as follows: "'He wore a garment of haircloth, with a girdle of leather about his loins.'" From this description, the king concluded that the man was Elijah. Thus in B', Mark is identifying John as Elijah for the reader.[57] By so doing, Mark clarifies for the reader that God's messenger in B refers to John (Elijah) and not to Jesus. B' completes the thought of B.[58] A, B: B' A ' have a chiastic pattern; all four point beyond Jesus and John to their theological significance. C in the middle describes John's actual activity.

---

[57] See Mk 9:11-13, where the disciples are told what the reader knows from the beginning.

[58] Matthew's reordering of Mark's material would appear to imply an awareness of Mark's chiastic ordering of B and B'. Matthew writes that John is the one spoken of by Isaiah, followed by the Isaiah quote (Mk 1:3), followed immediately by the description of John, introduced

In summary, the same type of concentric and chiastic ordering of material is found in Mark 1:1-8 as was found in 2:1-3:6. Within the space of a single narrative, no longer than some of the individual controversy pericopes, the same structuring techniques have been used. Moreover, Mark 1:1-8 are the opening verses of the gospel. Mark's audience is alerted from the very beginning to Mark's use of symmetrical and chiastic patterns.

Mark 4:1-34

The combination of materials to be found in the parable discourse presents two problems for the exegete: first, the problem of Jesus' audience within the narrative, and second, the problem of the conflict in meaning between the notion that Jesus taught in parables to hinder general understanding (4:11-12,34) and the idea that the purpose is understanding (4:21-22).[59]

The first problem, that of internal audience, is inescapable and insoluble. The narrative opens with Jesus in a boat on the lake, teaching the crowd on the shore (4:1-2). Then, in v. 10, a change of scene is depicted, and Jesus is alone with the twelve and those with them. In vv. 33-34, the conclusion of the discourse, the narrative

---

emphatically: Αὐτος δε ὁ 'Ιωάννης (Mt 3:3-4). Matthew also makes explicit the identification of John the Baptist with Elijah in Mt 17:13, his parallel to Mk 9:11-13.

[59] In addition, there are many problems in the exegesis of individual materials in the parable discourse. Such problems, however, fall outside the scope of the discussion of concentric structure in Mark.

assumes that Jesus has been continuing all along to address the crowd. And in vv. 35-36, Jesus is depicted still sitting in the boat. Nowhere in the narrative is the reader informed how Jesus could be alone with his disciples and remain seated in the boat addressing the multitude.

It is not clear, however, that the shift in internal audience and setting was a real problem for first century readers. The discrepancy remains as obvious in Matthew (Mt 13:1-2,10,34,36), and is obscured but not obviated in Luke (Lk 8:4,9,19). The same phenomenon of shifts in Jesus' audience which are not logically accounted for has already been observed in Mark's and Luke's versions of the healing of the paralytic (Mk 2:1-12, Lk 5:17-26).[60] If the parable discourses and the healing of the paralytic are any indication, perhaps it was not important for a first century popular author to account for changes in the internal audience of a narrative.

The second problem, essentially whether the purpose of Jesus' teaching was to hide or reveal, was clearly recognized as a problem by Matthew and Luke. Each of them transposes some of the material found in Mark 4:1-34 to other parts of his gospel so that the strong juxtaposition found in the markan discourse is avoided.[61] However, the juxtaposition--or contrast or paradox--may be part of Mark's intention in chapter four, and he may be employing concentric ordering of material in order to make his point. It was noted in the first chapter that Lund found one of the characteristics of concentric structure to be the introduction of an opposing idea in the middle of the pattern. "At the centre there is often a change in the trend of thought, and an antithetic idea is introduced. After this the original trend is resumed and continued until the system is concluded."[62] And in the analysis of 2:1-3:6, it was observed that in the first and last pericopes, when the opponents posit capital charges against Jesus, he triumphs, accomplishing resurrection-type miracles, while in the middle pericope, when opposition to Jesus is virtually absent, he himself alludes to his coming death.

---

[60] See above, pp. 132-134.

[61] Matthew excludes the sayings implying open teaching from his parable discourse in Mt 13. Luke ends his parallel to the markan discourse with the sayings implying revelation (Lk 8:4-18) and places his kingdom parables elsewhere (Lk 13). Thus, Luke's discourse has a movement from hidden to open. Luke, like Mark, combines parables and general sayings material, while Matthew restricts his discourse to parable material.

There is abundant evidence of symmetrical rhythm to be found in Mark 4:1-34. The introduction to the parable discourse, vv. 1-2a, is a short independent scene such as that found in 2:1-2 and 2:13.[63] It has a concentric pattern which cannot be attributed to the natural ordering of content:

a Καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.
b   καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλεῖστος,
c   ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ,
b'   καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν.
a' καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά,

The order runs, Jesus teaching, the crowd, Jesus gets into a boat, the crowd, Jesus teaching. Only then does the introduction to the parable of the sower follow, "And he said to them in his teaching..." (4:2b).[64]

---

[62] Lund, Chiasmus, p. 41.

[63] See above, pp. 118-119, 143. Πάλιν in 4:1 refers back to 2:13.

The introductory scene is an elegant rhetorical unit. Lines a, b, b′, and a′ all begin with "and;" line c employs the subordinating conjunction, "so that." The verb "to teach" is used in lines a and a′ only. The word "crowd" occurs only in lines b and b′. In b, the modifier of "crowd" follows it, and the phrase occurs at the end of the line. In b′, the modifier of "crowd" precedes it, and the phrase occurs at the beginning of the line. And line c, εἰς πλοῖοω ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ has a chiastic syntactical rhythm: prepositional phrase, verb (participle), verb (infinitive), prepositional phrase. Both prepositional phrases serve to define Jesus′ precise place--in a boat on the lake.

Mark 4:2b-20, the parable of the sower and its accompanying interpretation also has a five-part concentric pattern.[65] The parable of the sower in vv. 3-9 is balanced at the end by the interpretation of the parable in vv. 14-20. Verses 10-13 contain the disciples′ question about the parables in v. 10, and two separate and contradictory answers by Jesus in vv. 11-12 and 13. Verse 13,

> καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην,
> καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;

---

[64] Lambrecht (Marcus, p. 121) views the entirety of vv. 1-2 as the introduction, and fails to note the concentric pattern of vv. 1-2a.

[65] Lambrecht (ibid.) sees a three-part ring composition: vv. 3-9, 10-12, 13-20. He does not appear to notice that vv. 11-12 and v. 13 present two separate answers to the question in v. 10.

is not a logical continuation of vv. 11-12. On the other hand, the phrase "You do not know this parable?" is an unambiguous reference to the parable of the sower and the disciples′ question following it. Thus v. 13 rhetorically functions as an answer to the disciples′ question in v. 10, implying that they should be able to understand the parables. And interposed between vv. 10 and 13 is Jesus′ first answer, the sayings on the mystery of the kingdom and parables as impenetrable riddles to those outside.

Thus 4:2b-20 may be outlined as follows:

a	vv. 2b-9	The parable of the sower
b	v. 10	The question of the disciples about its meaning
c	vv. 11-12	The sayings on mystery and obduracy, an interposition
b′	v. 13	The reproof to the disciples for not understanding
a′	vv. 14-20	The interpretation of the parable of the sower

This rhetorical structure brings out the contrast between the idea presented in the center (c) that the parables are a mystery in need of explanation and the idea in the remainder of the narrative (which reads smoothly without the interposition of c) that parables are intended to be understood.

If the foregoing rhetorical analysis of 4:1-2a and 2b-20 is accepted, then it seems reasonable to suggest that the entire parable discourse has a loose five-part symmetrical rhythm. The hearer of the discourse has been attuned to five-part symmetry, first by the rhetorically elegant introduction,and then by the repetition of the pattern in vv. 2b-20. He may well be prepared for it in the section as a whole.

The discourse may be outlined as follows:

A	vv. 1-2a	Introduction
B	vv. 2b-20	Parable material
C	vv. 21-25	Sayings material
B′	vv. 26-32	Parable material
A′	vv. 33-34	Conclusion[66]

The conclusion, A′, forms an inclusio with the introduction, A: Jesus is speaking to the people in parables. The conclusion also recapitulates the idea of the interposition in B (vv. 11-12), that parables are a means of hindering understanding for outsiders:

> With many such parables he spoke the word to them, as they were able to hear it; he did not speak to them without a parable, but privately to his own disciples he explained everything. (4:33-34)

The conclusion to the entire discourse, directly following two parables for which no explanation is given, reinforces the idea of vv. 11-12, so that, in effect, the entire parable discourse stands under the idea that parables are incomprehensible riddles to outsiders.

In spite of the fact that B has a five-part symmetrical pattern, while B′ consists of two parallel units, there seem to be sufficient rhetorical clues to consider B and B′ parallel to each other in the rhetorical pattern of the parable discourse. In the first place, B and B′ each contain two major parable units: in B, the parable of the sower and its interpretation; in B′, the two parables on the kingdom of God. Further, B and B′ are also connected by hook words. The "kingdom of God," the subject of the two parables in B′, is introduced into B by means of the interposition (vv. 11, 26, 30). The verb "to sow" occurs only in the parable discourse, three times in the parable of the sower, six times in its interpretation in B, and two times in the second parable in B′ (vv. 3bis,4,14,15bis,16,18,20,31,32). "Earth" is used four times in B, three times in the parable and once in its interpretation, and four times in B′, twice in each parable (vv. 5bis,8,20,26,28,31bis). Καρποφορέω is used twice only in Mark, at the end of B, and near the beginning of B′ (vv. 20,28). Likewise, πετεινόν is used twice only in Mark, but at the beginning of B and the end of B′ (vv. 4,32). Some of these hook words (e.g., "to sow") may well be the accidental result of the content. But they do indicate the similarity of content between B and B′. And the balance in number of uses and the placing of some of them suggest that they are functioning as hook words as well.

---

[66] Lambrecht′s overall concentric pattern is the same, except that he makes the division between A and B between vv. 2 and 3 (Ibid.).

C, the middle section, is set off from B and B′ by difference in form: it contains general sayings material, not parables properly speaking.[67] In structure, the section has a chiastic pattern: sayings, exhortation to the audience: exhortation to the audience, sayings (vv. 21-22, 23 : 24a, 24b-25).[68] Exhortations to the

---

[67] The fact that Mark can call general sayings "parables" (e.g., 3:23) does not need to imply that he is unaware of the difference in form between proverbial material and a true parable.

[68] In terms of the structural outline, the middle section could be described as two parts, C and C′.

audience at the beginning and/or ending of teaching are found elsewhere in Mark, in the parable discourse and in the apocalyptic discourse in Mark 13. However, nowhere else in Mark are two exhortations found adjacent to each other, separated only by an introductory formula, "And he said to them." The fact that it occurs here helps to give a symmetrical rhythm to the overall parable discourse, and to indicate to the hearer that C is the middle or hinge section.[69] The fact that it occurs here helps to give a symmetrical rhythm to the overall parable discourse, and to indicate to the hearer that C is the middle or hinge section.

C, with its idea of everything being made manifest and coming to light, counters the idea that the purpose of parables is to hinder understanding, which through its occurrence in vv. 11-12 and 33-34, dominates the understanding of parables in the discourse as a whole. Further, the same contrast, between parables as riddles needing interpretation and parables as a means of open communication, occurs in part B (vv. 2b-20) and again in the entire discourse (vv. 1-34). In B, the idea of secrecy is found only in the center in contrast with the rest of B. In the discourse as a whole, the idea of open revelation is found in the center, in contrast with the rest of the discourse.

Twice, using the same rhetorical means, the same juxtaposition or paradox is presented to the reader. The juxtaposition is also rhetorically stressed. In each instance, the opposite idea is presented in the middle of a larger symmetrical unit, and set somewhat apart from it. Thus, the symmetrical rhythm employed in 4:1-34 functions to highlight the contrast or paradox of parables as a means of revelation _and_ as riddles. Both understandings are presented to the reader at one and the same time as true, depending on whether the reader chooses to be among those "with Jesus" or among "those outside."

---

[69] In Luke's parallel to Mk 4:21-25, he only has one exhortation in the middle (Lk 8:16-18).

To be sure, Mark 4:1-34 has a looser structure than that to be found in Mark 2:1-3:6. Nonetheless, there seem to be sufficient congruent parallelisms of content, form, and hook words to posit a symmetrical pattern. Further, the prior use of the same rhythm in 4:1-2a and again in 2b-20 has prepared the hearer for the use of the pattern in the larger unit.

Mark 11-12

In chapter two, the problem of understanding the rhetorical structure and function of the Jerusalem public debate and teaching material was described, and the possibility of a premarkan collection or rhetorical pattern was dismissed as untenable.[70] Here it will be suggested that a loose symmetrical rhythm is to be recognized in 12:1-40. The rhythm clarifies the structure and helps to illumine the function of the public debate material in the Jerusalem public ministry. Before turning to a description of the symmetrical pattern, however, a few other rhetorical features of Mark 11-12 need to be noted. For it is these features that delimit the Jerusalem public ministry proper and that elucidate the rhetorical structure of portions of that ministry.

---

[70] See above, pp. 108-111.

Rhetorical features

The use of frames to delimit the public ministry

Mark 11:11 and 13:1. Day one, the prologue to the Jerusalem ministry, ends with Jesus entering the temple for the first time, "looking around at everything," and then departing for Bethany with the twelve (11:11).[71] On day three, when Jesus leaves the temple for the last time, one of his disciples observes, "Look, what wonderful stones and what wonderful buildings!" (13:1). 13:1 could follow 11:11 directly, without any disjuncture in the narrative. Indeed, the exclamation of the disciple would seem more appropriate upon his first sight of the temple complex, than after the two event-filled days in the temple precincts.

Thus 11:11 and 13:1, the first entrance and last exit from the temple, may serve as a narrative frame for the public ministry in the temple of days two and thee. It is similar to the narrative frame of people streaming to Jesus from everywhere surrounding the Galilean controversy section (1:45; 3:7-8). Unlike the frame around 2:1-3:6, however, this frame does not reflect a shift in content from the material it surrounds. Jesus' saying in 13:2 on the coming destruction of the temple confirms the themes of the proleptic destruction of the temple, the destruction of the wicked tenants, and the giving of the vineyard to others found in Mark 11:12.[72] The use of the address, "Teacher," in 13:1 emphasizes the verse's connection with Mark 12 in which Jesus as teacher is stressed. The notion that the days of Israel are nearing an end may also be implied in the phrase, ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, in 11:11.[73] Here the frame emphasizes a major theme of the material it encloses.

---

[71] The usual explanation of the first temple visit, that Jesus was inspecting the temple prior to the temple cleansing (Taylor, Mark, p. 458; Schweizer, Mark, p. 229; Lane, Mark, p. 398; cf. Kelber, Kingdom, p. 98), would seem to reflect a continuing biographical interest foreign to the gospel of Mark. The postponement of the temple cleansing to the second day does serve a rhetorical purpose in Mark. It enables Mark to introduce a second and private approach to Jerusalem, during which Jesus curses the fig tree in the hearing of his disciples. For this, Mark needs a second approach to Jerusalem, not a previous visit to the temple in which Jesus looks around at everything.

Mark 12:41-44; 14:3-9. The story of the widow's mite (12:41-44) and the story of the woman's annointing Jesus at Bethany (14:3-9) serve as a frame for the apocalyptic discourse at the end of day three, much as the two healings of blind men frame the way section (8:22-26; 10:46-52). The two stories have much in common. In both, Jesus praises the example of a woman who shows the way of service or self-giving. These are the only two such incidents in Mark in which an individual's act is praised. The widow's mite contrasts with the huge amount of money the nard is worth. In both, Jesus' saying is introduced by ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (12:43; 14:9). The stories are joined by the hook word, "poor," used twice in each story.[74] The parallelism of the two stories is beyond question.

---

[72] The saying, of course, also functions as a bridge to the apocalyptic discourse.

[73] Kelber, Kingdom, p. 98.

They are also suitable as a frame for the apocalyptic discourse, dealing with events to come after Jesus' passion. For both stories anticipate the events of 15:21-16:8. The widow gives "her whole life" (12:44), while Jesus says that the woman has annointed his body for burial (14:8). As in the two healings of blind men, in which there is progression from the two-stage healing in 8:22-26 to the instantaneous healing of Bartimaeus who then followed Jesus on the way in 10:46-52, so in the two stories about women, there is progression from the giving up of life to burial after death.

Each story is also contrasted with its immediate setting.[75] The story of the widow is joined to the preceding narrative of the condemnation of the scribes, not only by the hook word, "widow," but also by the contrast between the bad example of the scribes who act only for show, and the good example of the widow, who makes no showing at all with her two copper coins.[76] The generous act of the woman at Bethany is interposed between the chief priests seeking to arrest Jesus, and Judas coming to them to betray Jesus (14:1-2; 10-11.)

---

[74] Used elsewhere in Mark only in 10:21.

[75] While the parallelism between 12:41-44 and 14:3-9 does not appear to be mentioned in the literature, the contrast of the annointing at Bethany with its immediate context is often mentioned, and the contrast of the widow's behavior with that of the scribes sometimes noted (Perrin, Introduction, p. 159; Lane, Mark, pp. 442, 491-492).

[76] Given the literary relationship of 12:41-44 to 14:3-9 and 12:38-40, Donahue's contention of loose catchword construction cannot be sustained (The Christ, p. 116). As in the instance of hook words

Conclusion. The double use of the framing technique in the Jerusalem ministry marks 11:12-12:40 as the rhetorical unit to be investigated.[77] The intertwining of the literary connections is also impressive. The two frames overlap, 12:41-44 pointing ahead, while 13:1-2 refers back. 13:2 itself points both back and ahead in the narrative. The stories constituting the second frame, the widow's mite and the annointing at Bethany, not only serve as a frame for Mark 13, but also serve to point up contrast in their immediate context. The literary intertwining of material, while certainly not symmetrical, is as elaborate as the intertwining in 2:1-3:6. And it serves basically the same rhetorical function, to invite the reader/hearer to interrelate the material presented to him.

The rhetorical units in Mark 11:12-12:12

The rhetorical units in 11:12-12:12 were already discussed in the narrative overview in chapter two, and need only be summarized here.[78] First, 11:12-26 is a rhetorical subunit in the Jerusalem ministry in which the public cleansing of the temple is interposed into the frame of the cursing and withering of the fig tree witnessed only by the disciples. Here, the frame-interposition technique serves to set apart material from the on-going narrative--the same function

---

between 1:45 and 2:1-2, the hook word "widow" is indicative of both a break and a continuity in the narrative.

[77] It also confirms that the entrance scene is part of the prologue. See above, pp. 101-102.

[78] See above, pp. 102-106.

it served in 2:1-12 and 1:45-3:7-8. In this instance, however, it is the frame, private teaching to the disciples (and the reader),which is set apart from the linear narrative, not the interposition.

Secondly, 11:15-18, 27:33; 12:1-12 form a rhetorical unit, in structure like an extended controversy of the action-objection-vindication type. In the temple cleansing, Jesus acts objectionably. In the question on authority, the chief priests, elders and scribes question his authority to act. Jesus parries the question, but in the following allegorical parable of the wicked tenant, justifies his authority as that of God's son.[79] These three pericopes are also connected by the statement to the reader of the Jewish authorities' desire to destroy/arrest Jesus, found at the close of the first and last pericopes, and their fear of the crowd, noted in all three.

As in the case of the frames in Mark 11-13, the two rhetorical units in 11:12-12:12 overlap. The cleansing to the temple serves as part of both of them. In the first, the frame around it helps interpret for the reader the meaning of Jesus' acts in the temple--the proleptic fall of the temple and the end of the time of Israel. In the second, the temple cleansing serves as the starting point of Jesus' confrontation with the legitimate Jewish authorities.

Further, 12:12 may recall 3:6 to the reader's mind. In 3:6, the Pharisees, the leaders of the synagogues, abandon the synagogue to Jesus after their confrontation with him, but with the intention of destroying him. In 12:12, the chief priests (Sanhedrin), the leaders of the temple, leave the temple to Jesus after their confrontation with him, but with the intention of arresting him.

---

[79] 'Υιὸν ἀγαπητόν (12:6, see 1:11, 9:7).

A symmetrical pattern in Mark 12:1-40

In the foregoing discussion of rhetorical features, it has been argued that 11:11 and 13:1, and 12:41-44 and 14:3-9 are frames around Jesus' public ministry and the apocalyptic discourse respectively. Further, it has been argued that the use of the frame-interposition technique in 11:12-26 has served to set apart the frame from the ongoing narrative of Jesus' ministry. If these arguments are accepted, then the Jerusalem public ministry consists of 11:15-18,27-12:40.

It has also been argued that 11:15-18,27-33 and 12:1-12 are a rhetorical subunit within the public ministry. Mark 12:13-40--the three questions on taxes, the resurrection and the first commandment, and the two teachings critical of the scribes--remains to be investigated to see if they have any rhetorical pattern of their own. It will be argued below, first, that the three questions are a clearly delineated ring composition, and second, that the ring composition may be extended to a larger, but looser symmetrical pattern encompassing 12:1-40. Given the numerous literary intertwinings, overlappings and double uses of pericopes and verses already noted in the Jerusalem material, it should not surprise the reader that 12:1-12 functions rhetorically in two ways. Finally, brief consideration will be given to the question of how the symmetrical rhythm helps the reader to understand the role of the public debate material in the Jerusalem ministry.

12:13-34 as a rhetorical unit. It was suggested in the narrative overview in chapter two that the debates over taxes, resurrection and the first commandement were a rhetorical subunit. In spite of the fact that the first two have hostile opponents while the third does not, they are similar in form. In all three, the debate is initiated by people seeking Jesus' opinion on some issue. Thus all three belong to the variant of the debate form in which Jesus engages in no objectionable acts.[80] They all belong to the type in which extended dialogue often occurs.[81] And in all three, the dialogue is expanded beyond simple question and answer.[82] In all three, the type of answer which Jesus gives is similar, a direct answer to the question posed.[83] Unlike 2:1-3:6 in which Jesus bases his answer on his own authority and/or his ability to heal, the Jesus of Mark 12:13-34 argue on grounds that the Jews would accept. He plays the game according to his questioners' rules. In all three, Jesus is addressed as "teacher" (12:14,19,32).[84] In all three stories, Jesus appears as a successful and skilled debator, a teacher of wisdom.[85]

---

[80] See above, pp. 46-49.

[81] I.e., the dialogue form posited by Dodd, "Dialogue," pp. 54-60. In fact, Dodd only classifies 12:13-17 as a dialogue. See above, pp. 45-46.

[82] Albertz (Streitsgespräche, pp. 19-22) rightly stresses the richness of the dialogue in the Jerusalem debate material.

[83] What Kuhn has called a "Jewish type argument" (Sammlungen, p. 88).

[84] It is not clear, however, whether "teacher" should be considered

In content, all three do concern issues current in the Judaism of the time.[86] That political subservience to Rome symbolized by the tribute was an issue is sufficiently evident from the two Jewish wars. The intra-Jewish debate over resurrection between the Sadducees and the Pharisees is attested to by Paul's confrontation with the Sanhedrin in Acts 23 and by Josephus.[87] The question of the fundamental law was also an issue, as can be seen from the story of the proselyte who wished to be taught the law while standing on one foot.[88]

Further, the content of Jesus' answers would appeal to the same group within first century Judaism. The Pharisees may wonder at Jesus' escape from the political dilemma posed him but they are basically in agreement with his answer (12:17). Moreover, the Pharisees and scribes would agree with Jesus' response to the Sadducees in

---

a hook word indicative of structure or a key word indicating a theme of Jesus' public ministry in Jerusalem. Jesus is again addressed as "teacher" by the disciples in 13:1, part of the frame around the Jerusalem ministry. Furthermore, the verb, "to teach," introduces Jesus' sayings in the temple and about the Son of David (11:17; 12:35). It also occurs in the introductory statement by the questioners in 12:14. Finally, the noun "teaching" is used in the introduction to Jesus' warning against the scribes (12:38). Thus "teacher" in 12:14,19 and 32 may be part of the use of various forms of "teach" as key words in the Jerusalem ministry.

[85] Albertz, Streitgespräche, p. 18; Trocmé, Jesus, p. 53; Donahue, The Christ, pp. 117-118.

[86] Albertz, Streitgespräche, p. 26.

[87] Jewish Antiquities, xviii, 12-17.

[88] B. Sabbat 31a, as cited in Taylor, Mark, p. 486. See also The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Issachar 5:2, 7:6; Dan 5:3.

regard to resurrection: that they know neither the scriptures not the power of God (12:24). In the question of the first commandment, Jesus and the scribe explicitly agree on the fundamental demand of God (12:32-34). Thus, in all three public debates, Jesus and the Pharisaic scribal faction of Judaism are on common ground.[89] The three debates serve the function of showing Mark's reader where Jesus agrees with Judaism.

Thus, the three public debates are similar in form, in the type of dialogue and in content. Jesus' agreement with Judaism which they portray contrasts with Jesus' criticism of the Jewish leaders in his direct teaching which precedes and follows 12:13-34. The similarity of the three debates and their contrast with their immediate setting are sufficient to establish 12:13-34 as a rhetorical subunit within the Jerusalem public ministry.

12:13-34 as a ring composition. The parallels (and differences) among the three pericopes go beyond the similarities mentioned above to indicate that the three are structured as a ring composition. In structure, the first and the third have a double interchange of dialogue between the questioner and Jesus.[90] In the middle debate, there is only a single exchange of dialogue, but, in effect, a double question and answer. The Sadducees, trying to discredit the idea of resurrection, posit the conundrum of the women who married seven brothers. Jesus first resolves the riddle and then argues for resurrection, answering the issues in reverse or chiastic order.

---

[89] So Johnson, Mark, p. 202. Knox (Sources, vol. 1, p. 91) notes that Jesus' answer to the Sadducees should lessen the Pharisees' hostility to him.

[90] In 12:13-17, Jesus speaks twice between the first and second speeches of the questioners.

The first and third debates are also related in content. In the first, Jesus says to give to God the things of God (12:17). In the third, Jesus spells out what the things of God are--to love God and neighbor (12:29-31). It completes the thought of the first, while the middle story deals with an entirely different issue, the resurrection. In both the first and the third, the questioners praise Jesus' teaching (12:14,32). The pericopes are joined by the hook phrase, ἐπ' ἀληθείας, both times in the mouth of the questioner. The Pharisees say in the preface to their question to Jesus, "with truth you teach the way of God" (12:14). In the third, the scribe responds to Jesus' answer to his question about the first commandment, "good, with truth you say" (12:32).[91] These are the only two uses of ἐπ' ἀληθείας in Mark, and they serve, in effect, as an inclusio for Mark 12:13-34.

Finally, the first and third stories are closely interwoven into their setting. In the first, the Pharisees and Herodians are sent by the Sanhedrin to see if they can entrap Jesus in his words (12:13). They open their question by a long (and insincere) introduction praising Jesus as a teacher (12:14). At the end of the debate, they wonder at him (12:17). In the third, the scribe, having heard the earlier debates and seeing that Jesus had answered well, asks his question (12:28). At the end of it, no one any longer dares question Jesus (12:34). The middle story, in contrast, is simply framed by the other two. The Sadducees are given no narrative introduction connecting them to the preceding narrative, and there is no audience reaction at the end.

---

[91] There are many other uses of hook words within each of the three debates (e.g., πλανάω in 12:24,27; καλῶς, ἰδὼν ὅτι...ἀπεκρίθη in 12:28,32, 34) but they fall outside the scope of a discussion of larger structural units.

The interweaving of the first and third stories into the continuing narrative also serves to give the section a sense of linear or climactic progression. The question of the Pharisees and Herodians is hostile in intent, and Jesus is aware of their hypocrisy (12:15). The scribe, after hearing the ensuing debates, is well-intentioned toward Jesus, and the scribe and Jesus praise each other's answers (12:32,34). Unlike 2:1-3:6, in which the level of hostility increased throughout the narrative, here the level of hostility decreases.[92] 12:13-34 is similar to 2:1-3:6 in that both linear development and symmetrical rhythm occur in the same composition.

The extension of the symmetrical pattern to 12:1-40

There seems to be no a priori reason why the rhetorical symmetrical rhythm might not end with the ring composition of 12:13-34. However, that would leave two loosely attached episodes of Jesus' teaching in the Jerusalem public ministry, a unit otherwise quite clearly structured and, in rhetorical terms, extensively interconnected and interwoven. Further, the beginning of the ring composition is closely interwoven with the preceding pericope. It is the Sanhedrin, the opponents of 12:12 who send the Pharisees and the Herodians to try to discredit Jesus (12:12-13). Also, the pericope following the ring composition may well be connected. It begins, Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ 'Ιησοῦς ἔλεγεν (12:35). This is the *only* instance in the gospel of Mark in which ἀποκρίνομαι occurs at the beginning of a unit of narrative and the only instance in which it occurs without an obvious referrent. This suggests that its use in 12:35 may also have a referrent,[93] the preceding debates. Thus at both the beginning and the end of the ring composition, there appear to be rhetorical indications of continuity. It would seem to be worthwhile to investigate if the ring composition may be part of a larger symmetrical pattern.

---

[92] 2:1-3:6 and 12:13-34, however, are alike in that the middle story does not contribute significantly to the increase or decrease of hostility.

Mark 12:10-12, 35-37. Turning to the material directly adjacent to the ring composition, several parallels between 12:10-12 and 12:35-37 are readily apparent. Both are direct teachings of Jesus, not an answer to any specific question addressed to Jesus. In both, Jesus explicitly quotes from scripture. Both are citations from the Psalms, Ps. 118:22-23 in vv. 10-11, and Ps. 110:1 in v. 36. The two passages are similar in content as well as in form. In both, Jesus uses the psalm to attack Jewish messianic expectations: in the first, Jesus warns the Jewish leaders that they will reject the one whom God will establish; in the second, Jesus warns indirectly that no Davidic messiah is coming to restore the fortunes of Israel.[94]

---

[93] Of the thirty uses of ἀποκρίνομαι in Mark, all but five occur in the context of dialogue, and may be translated into English (easily, if sometimes redundantly) as "answer" or "reply." In the four uses in which "say" rather than "answer" or "reply" would be more normal English, whatever the speaker is responding to is clear from the text. In 9:5,6, Peter is "replying to" the sight of Jesus talking with Elijah and Moses. In 11:14, Jesus is reacting to the fig tree's lack of figs. In 14:48, Jesus is responding to the fact that the group came out to arrest him away from the temple carrying swords and clubs. This brief survey of the evidence suggests that the last "odd" use, ἀποκρίνομαι in 12:35 may not be dismissed as a redundant participle but should be understood in the sense of Jesus' replying to the foregoing debates.

Moreover, both passages are followed by audience reactions. The content of the reactions is antithetic (as in 2:1-3:6). In 12:12 the opponents seek to arrest Jesus, but fear the crowd, so they depart. In 12:37, the great crowd listens to Jesus gladly. While the crowd presumably witnesses all the debates and teaching in 12:1-40, they play no role in the three public debates in vv. 13-34. The word "crowd" is only employed in vv. 12 and 37 in Mark 12:1-40. Further, in both instances the crowd supports Jesus.[95] There are sufficient congruent parallels of form, content and hook words between vv. 10-12 and 35-37 to establish their parallelism, and thereby to posit the extension of the symmetrical pattern beyond the ring composition in 12:13-34.

---

[94] For the use of the title, "Son of David," in Mark (10:47-48; 11:10; 12:35-37) as part of Mark's polemic against royal messianism and Jewish nationalistic eschatological hopes, see John Dominic Crossan, "Redaction and Citation in Mark 11:9-10,17 and 14:27", Book of Seminar Papers, (ed. Lane C. McGaughy; SBLASP 108; Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), Vol. 1, p. 28; Kelber, Kingdom, pp. 95-96. Johnson, (Mark, p. 205) writes, "Mark is quite uninterested in it [Jesus' Davidic descent]; he regards it as irrelevant to Jesus' true nature...and he would ignore or deny it rather than confuse Jesus with the conventional Messiah." See also Lane, Mark, pp. 437-438.

[95] The parallelism of the two audience reactions may account for the apparently strange fact that the crowd reacts gladly to criticism of the idea of the Davidic messiah.

Mark 12:1-9, 38-40. The foregoing analysis suggests that vv. 1-9, the parable about the wicked tenants, and vv. 38-40, the woes on the scribes, may also be parallel and part of the symmetrical pattern. Here the parallels are not so substantial or numerous. Nonetheless, they do exist. The form is different: vv. 1-9 are an allegorical parable; vv. 38-40 are a warning against the scribes. Both, however, are direct teachings of Jesus. Further, there is similarity of content. In both, Jesus attacks the behavior of the Jewish leaders. In vv. 1-9, he criticizes the leaders' treatment of God's messengers. In vv. 38-40, Jesus criticizes the scribes for seeking their own worldly position in the market places and synagogues and ignoring God's demands for justice to widows.[96] And each passage ends with a prophecy of doom on the Jewish leaders: "What will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the tenants, and give the vineyard to others" (12:9); "They will receive the greater condemnation" (12:40).[97]

Against the paralellism of vv. 1-9 and 38-40, it may be argued that vv. 1-9 are substantially longer than vv. 38-40 and that 12:1-12 constitutes a single unit marked by the inclusio, παραβολαῖς/ παραβολῆν (vv. 1,12) while vv. 35-40 are clearly two separate units, each with its own introduction (vv. 35,38).[98] These arguments would not seem sufficient to discredit the parallelism of the symmetrical pattern. Even in the elegant pattern in 2:1-3:6, the healing of the paralytic is substantially longer than the healing of the man with the withered hand. In the parable discourse in Mark 4, the B section on the parable of the sower (4:2b-20) is longer than B′ (4:26-32).[99] Further, B is a single rhetorical unit, while B′ consists of two short independent parables. The technique of symmetrical patterning exhibits considerable variation, and the pattern in Mark 12:1-40 would seem to fall well within the limits of that variety.

---

[96] In order to enhance the parallelism, the scribes (rather than the Pharisees as in Matthew and Luke) may be the group condemned in 12:38-40. For the opponents in 12:1-12 are the chief priests, elders and scribes, the members of the Sanhedrin. Thus the scribes are condemned in both instances.

[97] An instance of the divine passive.

Finally, the idea of God′s ultimate judgment found in 12:9 and 40 is contrasted with the idea of God′s pwoer of resurrection or salvation found in the middle public debate with the Sadducees. Those who are resurrected will be "like angels in heaven," for "He is not God of the dead, but of the living" (12:25,27). As has been seen in 2:1-3:6 and 4:1-34, opposite ideas often occur in the extremes and center of a symmetrical pattern.

For the symmetry indeed ends with 12:1-40. 12:41-44, the story of the widow's mite, is private teaching to the disciples and functions as a frame around Mark 13. 11:27-33 is a controversy apophthegm attacking Jesus' behavior. 11:27-33 and 12:41-44 are not parallel.

---

[98] In all probability, 12:1-9 and 10-11 came to Mark already joined in the tradition. In the Gospel of Thomas also, the texts are adjacent (logia 65,66).

[99] The opening section need not always be the longer one. In the three parallel passion predictions, it is the middle one which is the shortest, and the last which is longest.

The rhetorical pattern of Mark 12:1-40 as a whole

The symmetrical pattern. The symmetrical structure of 12:1-40 may be outlined as follows:

A	vv. 1-9	Public teaching:	The parable of the wicked tenants; threat of God's judgment
B	vv. 10-12	Public teaching:	Psalm citation; audience reaction
C	vv. 13-17	Public debate:	The things of God are to be given to God; audience reaction
D	vv. 18-27	Public debate:	The hope in resurrection is real
C′	vv. 28-34	Public debate:	The things of God are the commands to love God and neighbor; audience reaction
B′	vv. 35-37	Public teaching:	Psalm citation; audience reaction
A′	vv. 38-40	Public teaching:	Warning against the scribes; threat of God's judgment

First, Jesus in direct teaching attacks the behavior of the Jewish leaders, prophesies their destruction, and their rejection of the one whom God will establish (A, B, 12:1-12). Then in three interwoven debates, Jesus answers questions on basic issues of Judaism, showing his agreement with the Pharisaic scribal position on the political issue of taxation, in the hope of resurrection, and on the fundamental demand of God (C,D,C′, 12:13-34). Then once again in direct teaching, Jesus attacks the scribes' understanding of christology, warns against their behavior, and prophesies their condemnation (B′, A′, 12:35-40).

UMI

A, B, B′ and A′ are all direct teaching of Jesus in which he attacks the Jewish leaders′ behavior and messianic ideas. C, D, and C′ are all public debates in which Jesus′ responses show his agreement with Jewish tenets. Thus, the symmetrical rhythm of 12:1-40 may be viewed as an extended ring composition. The shift in form is congruent with the shift in content. Mark 12:1-40 has a pattern of Jesus′ provocation of Jewish leaders, followed by his affirmation of basic Jewish (Pharisaic) beliefs, followed again by provocation of the scribes. The three public debates and Jesus′ two attached teachings against the scribes have their place in the structure of the Jerusalem public ministry as constituent elements of the symmetrical pattern of provocation, defense, provocation. As in 2:1-3:6, and 4:1-34, a symmetrical rhythm or concentric structure serves to unify diverse and contrasting materials into a coherent literary whole.

Linear or climactic development. As in 2:1-3:6, 12:1-40 has a linear or climactic progression as well as a symmetrical pattern. In both sections, the climactic progression is not in the content per se. In 2:1-3:6, the most serious charges against Jesus are in the first and last controversies--blasphemy and healing on the sabbath. In 12:1-40, Jesus′ provocation and denunciation of the Jewish leaders is as strong in 12:35-40 as it was in 12:1-11. Rather the sense of climactic progression is given by the actions and reactions of Jesus′ audience, the crowd and the opponents.

In contrast to the Galilean controversy section, however, in Mark 12, the development is one of the declining evidence of overt opposition to Jesus. The section opens with the attempt of the representatives of the Sanhedrin to arrest Jesus (12:12). The change from hostile to friendly questioners in the sequence of public debates has already been described.[100] Overt opposition to Jesus ends entirely after the third debate, when the reader is informed that no one dared question Jesus further (12:34). Finally, in 12:37 the reader is told that "the great throng heard him gladly." The emphasis in 12:1-40 is not on the growing opposition to Jesus but on Jesus' triumph over his opponents, his successful vindication of himself. As R.H. Lightfoot writes:

> We are struck by the supremacy and, if we may use the word, the buoyancy of Jesus in dealing with the situations which successively confront him, and his complete success. This impression is confirmed by the references to the astonishment and interest of the multitude, which is represented as giving him support and even sympathy.[101]

The double function of 12:1-12 in Mark 11-12. As noted earlier, 12:1-12 is both part of the rhetorical unit, 11:15-18,27-12:12, the climax of the sequence begun with Jesus' cleansing of the temple, and part of the rhetorical unit of 12:1-40, the beginning of the symmetrical pattern.[102]

A somewhat similar rhetorical overlapping may be seen in 2:1-12, the story of the healing of the paralytic. It is clearly the first controversy story in the gospel and the opening or introduction to the Galilean controversy section. Yet it also continues and heightens the theme of Jesus' popularity with the crowd begun in 1:21 (2:1-2,12).[103] The crowd, as a character, does not fade out of the Galilean controversy section until after the second controversy, the call of Levi. In 12:1-12, the reiteration of the Sanhedrin's desire to destroy Jesus heightens the opposition already stated at the end of the temple cleansing (11:18; 12:12). It is only gradually in 12:1-40 that the opposition recedes, and the theme of Jesus' success and popularity comes to dominate the narrative. Thus 2:1-3:6 and 12:1-40 exhibit a parallel if antithetic development of the motifs of the opposition to and popularity of Jesus.

---

[100] See above, p. 276.

[101] History and Interpretation, p. 123.

[102] See above, p. 271, 277-280.

The healing of the paralytic, however, is rhetorically set off from the material which precedes it by means of the contrasting frame around 2:1-3:6. Such is not the case with 12:1-12. The lack of any rhetorical break at 12:1 is an indication of the rhetorical and content unity of the entire Jerusalem public ministry (11:15-18, 27-12:40).

Mark 12:1-40 in the Jerusalem public ministry

As in the case of the Galilean controversy section, so in Mark 12:1-40 both the symmetrical pattern and the climactic development help the reader to interpret the materials presented in the text.

---

[103] Johnson (Mark, pp. 24, 55) considers 2:1-12 a transition scene.

Given the interconnection of the two rhetorical units, 11:15-18,27-12:12 and 12:1-40, a full discussion of how the structure aids in understanding the text would have to encompass the entire Jerusalem public ministry. Since the focus of this chapter, however, is on concentric structure, the following discussion will be limited to a brief indication of how the symmetrical pattern helps to bring out the theme of 12:1-40 and of the function of the three public debates.[104]

Jesus or the Jewish leaders?

It was suggested earlier that 12:1-12 may be understood as Jesus' reply to the question on the source of his authority, whether it is from God or men (11:27-33).[105] Here it is suggested that the entire section, 12:1-40, is an answer to that question in which Jesus not only affirms that his authority is from God, but charges in turn that the Jewish leaders' authority in fact derives from men.[106] In 12:1-11, at the beginning of the symmetrical pattern, Jesus accuses the legitimate Jewish authorities of rejecting and mistreating God's messengers. In 12:38-40, at the close of the pattern, Jesus accuses the scribes of seeking their own status and violating the ethical rights of others. In both, Jesus claims God's authority when he speaks as a prophet announcing God's judgment against the Jewish leaders (12:9,40).

---

[104] Thus questions of Mark's anti-temple or anti-Jerusalem polemic and his reorientation of Jewish (or Jewish-Christian) eschatological hopes fall outside the scope of the discussion. On these issues, see Kelber, Kingdom, pp. 92-128; Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," pp. 172-183; Donahue, The Christ, pp. 113-135.

[105] See above, pp. 104-106.

[106] On Mark's general attitude toward civil and religious authority, see Kolenkow, "Beyond Miracles," pp. 184-185. Lane (Mark, pp. 412, 441) notes that the leading idea of 11:27-12:27 is that "the leaders of the Jewish people have rejected the will of God," and that 12:38-40 reinforces the conflict between Jesus and the Jewish authorities.

Material in the central public debate section also emphasizes the theme of who--Jesus or the Jewish authorities--is acting for God. In the first debate, the Pharisees and the Herodians in their preface to their question say to Jesus, οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις (12:14). Their intention in making the statement is hypocritical (12:15). However, the content of the statement from Mark's point of view is correct.

In the third debate, the double command of love underscores the idea that the Jewish leaders are not acting for God but for "men." Rejection of God's messengers is contrary to the command to love God with all one's heart, soul, mind and strength. Devouring widows' houses is a violation of the command to love one's neighbor as oneself. The contrast between God's demand for love of God and neighbor and the Jewish leaders' behavior highlights the fact that the section is not only a defense that Jesus' authority is from God, but an indictment of the Jewish establishment for not deriving their authority from God.

The role of the three public debates, 12:13-34

It was noted in the narrative overview of Mark 11-12 in chapter two that the function of the three public debates in the Jerusalem public ministry has not been clear to exegetes. Here it will be argued that the fact that the debates exhibit Jesus' _agreement_ with basic Jewish beliefs explains their rhetorical function in the narrative of the Jerusalem public ministry.

In the cleansing of the temple and again in 12:1-12, Jesus has acted as an angry prophet denouncing the Jewish authorities and prophesying their destruction. Further, by means of the image of the beloved son and the rejected stone which God establishes as head of the corner (12:6, 10-11), the narrative implies that Jesus is not only a prophet, but more than a prophet, that he is God's son, the messiah.

As a prophet, Jesus may not be dismissed by the Jewish leaders out of hand, as Jeremiah could not be killed outright when he predicted the fall of the first temple (Jer 7,26). The Jewish establishment must first show Jesus to be a false prophet, not speaking for God. In the ensuing public debates, however, Jesus demonstrates that he stands on the ground of true Judaism. The agreement between Jesus and Jewish belief is made explicit in the scribe's and Jesus' approval of each other's answers to the question of God's fundamental command (12:28-34). Jesus' opponents' attempts to discredit him have instead served to establish Jesus as an orthodox Jew, therefore perhaps a legitimate prophet, when he hints at the destruction of the temple and the giving of the vineyard to others. It is precisely the agreement of Jesus with the Jewish leaders on matters of belief which silences Jesus' opponents so that they dare not question him further.[107]

---

[107] Commentators, beginning with Matthew (Mt 22:46) and Luke (Lk 20:40)

The placing of the public debates after Jesus' attack on the Jewish leaders is effective dramatic narrative.[108] Jesus' triumph over the Jewish leaders by means of his agreement with them on basic Jewish beliefs establishes Jesus' innocence as a Jew.[109] The Jews are left with no legal grounds for accusing Jesus.[110]

The Jerusalem public ministry might well have ended in 12:34 with the linear climax of Jesus' vindication of himself as a Jew, possibly a true prophet of God. The narrative, however, returns to Jesus'

---

have felt that the audience reaction, "And after that no one dared to ask him any question" (Mk 12:34), belongs after an incident in which Jesus and his opponents have disagreed, not when they have agreed. Günther Bornkamm, virtually alone among scholars, sees that it is the agreement of Jesus and the scribe which silences opposition. He writes that the phrase, if not displaced, "nur besagen kann: hier ist eine letzte Wahrheit ausgesprochen, über die hinaus es nichts mehr zu fragen und zu sagen gibt." ("Das Doppelgebot der Liebe," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, 2nd ed. [Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957], p. 90).

[108] This sequence of developments is not dissimilar from that of many radicals in the 1960's, such as the Berrigan brothers or William Sloane Coffin. In symbolic acts of civil disobedience and preaching, they attacked the establishment, calling attention to themselves. And their defense was that they were the ones who truly were acting in accord with the United States constitution and the Bill of Rights.

[109] The debates showing Jesus' agreement with Pharisaic Judaism also serve the function of reassuring the Jewish-Christians in Mark's audience that Jesus is a legitimate Jew and successor to Judaism. While the way of Jesus (and the disciples) breaks with the Pharisaic way in matters of tablefellowship, sabbath observance, and food regulations (2:1-3:6; 7), the way of Jesus stands in continuity with the old way in the belief in resurrection and in the understanding of the fundamental demand of God.

[110] Scholars such as Lightfoot (History and Interpretation, p. 124) and Burkill (Revelation, p. 203) have recognized the emphasis in Mark 12 on the unjustifiable nature of the opponents' hostility to Jesus, though they have not connected it with the fact that the public debates show Jesus' agreement with some Jewish beliefs.

offensive against the Jewish leaders, challenging their Davidic messianic hopes and prophesying their eschatological doom (12:35-40). The reversion to the earlier theme of Jesus' attack on his opponents recalls to the reader's mind the parable of the wicked tenants and its accompanying messianic challenge. By means of the symmetrical pattern Mark is underlining for the reader Jesus' messianic status and its eschatological consequences for the old Israel and its leaders.[111]

Conclusion

In the beginning of this chapter the question was raised whether 2:1-3:6 was an isolated example of symmetrical patterning in Mark, or whether symmetrical structures should be considered a markan literary or rhetorical technique. The evidence from the rhetorical structure of Mark 1:1-8, 4:1-34 and 12:1-40 is that concentric patterns should be considered a markan literary technique. Mark's fondness for circular rhythms includes not only the devices of interposition, "insertion," and "intercalation,"[112] but also more extended symmetrical patterns.

/ In chapter one, it was noted that concentric structure could be employed in original composition or as a means of structuring traditional material. Mark appears to use symmetrical rhythms in both ways. Mark 1:1-8 and 4:1-2a would seem to be markan compositions. The larger structures, 2:1-3:6, 4:1-34, and 12:1-40, obviously contain controversies, parables, etc., found in the tradition. Even here, the extent and type of Mark's redactional activity to create the concentric pattern may vary. In 4:1-34, Mark may be working from a parable collection or source into which he has interpolated additional materials at various points, giving the whole a symmetrical pattern.[113] In 12:1-40, Mark does not appear to be building upon any premarkan collection or source.[114] Except for the probable premarkan joining of the parable of the wicked tenants and the psalm citation about the rejected stone, Mark appears to have constructed the section by joining previously independent traditions.[115] Here, Mark has used the device of a symmetrical pattern to structure disparate material.

---

[111] Lightfoot (History and Interpretation, pp. 123-124) writes about Mark 11-12, "a connexion seems to be implied between the doom which hangs over the Jewish nation, and the impending death of the Messiah himself. Each is involved in the ruin of the other. By rejecting the Messiah and encompassing his end, his own nation brings condemnation on itself and he goes down with it." In 12:1-40, the argument moves beyond the immediate consequences for Jesus and Jerusalem, to God's ultimate condemnations of the Jewish leaders and God's power of resurrection. See above, p. 280.

[112] See above, pp. 33-36.

---

[113] For example, Kuhn (Sammlungen, pp. 99-146, esp. pp. 122-146) argues, on the whole convincingly, that Mk 4:3-10 (λέγει αὐτοῖς from v. 13), 14-20, 26-33 is a premarkan parable collection. If Kuhn is correct, then Mark has inserted vv. 11-13 into vv. 3-20 (B) in such a way that vv. 3-20 have a five-part symmetrical pattern. And he has expanded the introduction and conclusion and inserted vv. 21-25 in such a way that the entire parable discourse also has a five-part symmetrical pattern. Both interpolations are necessary to their respective symmetrical structures and together they present the paradox involved in understanding parables. If Kuhn is correct, then the markan insertions are a strong argument for extended concentric patterns as a markan literary technique for structuring material. (Kuhn's literary argument, however, that καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς [vv. 2,11,21,24] is a markan introductory formula while καὶ ἔλεγεν [vv. 9,26,30] derives from the tradition seems weak [Ibid., pp. 130-131]. Mark easily could have inserted αὐτοις after ἔλεγεν in his source if his preference for an indirect object were that strong. Ἔλεγεν without an indirect object is employed in 12:35,38 which appear to be markan connectives.)

[114] See above, pp. 108-111.

[115] Knox (Sources, Vol. 1, p. 88) suggests that 12:13-34 might

Whatever the degree of Mark's compositional or redactional activity, Mark appears to employ symmetrical patterns to interrelate and contrast material. In Mark 1:1-8, the symmetry clarifies the role of John the Baptist as the forerunner, Elijah. In Mark 4:1-34, the pattern highlights the paradox of parables as a means of revelation and as a mystery in need of explanation. In Mark 12:1-40, the pattern contrasts Jesus' attack on the Jewish leaders with his defense of himself as a good Jew. In all instances, awareness of the symmetrical rhythm helps the reader to understand the text.[116]

Criteria for Identifying Concentric Patterns, Reconsidered

Criteria employed in Mark 1:1-8; 4:1-34 and 12:1-40

In the earlier discussion of criteria, it was concluded that a concentric structure may be posited in the text on the basis of multiple congruent parallelisms of content, form-critical classification, structure, and word repetition (hook words).[117] The impact of the various criteria is cumulative. Mark 2:1-3:6 met all of the criteria: parallelisms of content, form, structure and the presence

---

have been gathered together prior to Mark. However, the close interweaving of the material into is larger setting, and the varied use and placing of the double command of love in the tradition (see Mt 22:34-40; Lk 10:25-28, Did 1:2) suggest that Mark was more likely the compiler.

[116] In regard to 2:1-3:6, see above, pp. 212-218, 222-227.

[117] See above, pp. 231-238.

of hook words. None of the concentric patterns posited in this chapter is as elegant or elaborate as 2:1-3:6. A brief review of the criteria employed to identify these structures may help to clarify the relative importance of the various criteria and suggest additional criteria.

Mark 1:1-8. In Mark 1:1-8. the symmetrical pattern was posited almost entirely on the basis of manifest content. The question of form is not really applicable in so short a narrative. The argument based on content was supported by two additional arguments. First, the rhetorical structure of C, the middle section, is itself a ring composition, an aba pattern in which the middle element, b, contains a verbal chiasm. Second, recognition of the symmetrical structure of vv. 1-8 helps to explain the function of v. 6 (B′) in the composition: B′ serves to elucidate the meaning of B (vv. 2-3).

Mark 4:1-34. The concentric pattern in the parable discourse was based primarily on the congruent parallelism of form and content. A and A′ are the editorial introduction and conclusion concerning Jesus′ teaching in parables. B and B′ are similar in form, consisting primarily of parable material. Further, the parables are similar in content. All the parables concern the earth and vegetation, sowing or harvest. The rhetorical structure of B and B′ was found to be quite different: B had a symmetrical pattern while B′ consisted of two parallel parables. B and B′ were, however, connected by hook words. C, the middle section, is different in form--sayings material not parables, and in content--everything is to be revealed.

As in the case of Mark 1:1-8, the argument in Mark 4 for the overall concentric pattern is buttressed by arguments based on the rhetorical structure of individual sections of the pattern. A, the introduction, is itself an elegant symmetrical construction alerting the reader to the possibility of a symmetrical pattern in the larger unit. B also has a symmetrical pattern. C, the mid-section, has a chiastic structure: saying, exhortation:exhortation, saying. In both Mark 1:1-8 and 4:1-34, the rhetorical structure of the middle section has helped to indicate to the reader that the center or turning point of the pattern has been reached.

Mark 12:1-40. The symmetrical structure of 12:1-40 was based on the congruent parallelism of form, content and structure. In content, A and A′ are both attacks on the behavior of Jewish leaders and prophecies of their condemnation; B and B′ concern the messiah; C and C′ concern the demands of God, and D is about resurrection. In form, A, B, B′, and A′ are all direct teaching of Jesus. B and B′ both feature centrally a citation from the psalms. C, D, and C′ are all public debates in which Jesus answers a question about Jewish belief. The parallelism of structure goes beyond the parallelism which may be attributed to formal similarity in the placing (not the content) of audience reactions following B, C, C′ and B′ but not A, D or A′. Further, in the public debate material, C and C′ are closely interwoven into the larger narrative while D is not. Also C and C′ consist of a double interchange between the questioner and Jesus, while D has only a single interchange.

The symmetrical pattern receives some confirmation from the presence of hook words. The word "crowd" occurs only in the audience reactions at the end of B and B′. The phrase "with truth" occurs near the beginning of C and near the end of C′. Jesus is addressed as "teacher" in all three public debates, C, D, and C′.

The arguments for the detailed symmetrical pattern are supported by the fact that the pattern as a whole may be viewed as a ring composition in which Jesus′ direct teaching critical of the Jewish leaders and their messianic understanding alternates with public debates in which Jesus appears as a good Jew. Finally, this pattern of provocation: defense: provocation helps to clarify the function of the public debates and the two teachings against the scribes in the Jerusalem public ministry.

Conclusion. The foregoing summary suggests that parallelism of manifest content may be the most important criterion for identifying concentric patterns. Form, whenever applicable, also appears to be central. The congruent shift of content and form (in which the content is not just a consequence of the form) in a symmetrical pattern appears to be a, if not the, central rhetorical feature of the extended concentric patterns in 2:1-3:6; 4:1-34 and 12:1-40. Parallelism of structure not attributable to similarity of form is a strong argument for a rhetorical pattern when it exists, as in 2:1-3:6 and 12:1-40. It does not, however, appear to be a necessary feature of a symmetrical pattern since it is not found in 4:1-34. In the texts surveyed, every audience reaction at the close of a pericope was paralleled by another audience reaction fitting the symmetrical pattern.[118] Editorial introductions beginning pericopes, however, were not always paralleled.[119]

Hook words congruent with the symmetrical pattern were noted in all the texts surveyed except for 1:1-8. In all instances, the hook words were supporting evidence for a parallelism already posited on the grounds of content and/or form or structure.[120] And in none of the passages analyzed were hook words a major indicator of the overall structure. These facts suggest that, in Mark, hook words are a secondary criterion for identifying extended rhetorical patterns, although they are reassuring confirmatory evidence.[121]

The review of criteria employed suggest two additional aids in identifying extended rhetorical structures. First, the rhetorical structure of the individual elements of the symmetrical pattern may help to alert the reader to the larger pattern.[122] In both 1:1-8 and 4:1-34 the symmetrical and/or chiastic structure of the middle element of the pattern helps to indicate that the center or turning point of a symmetrical pattern has been reached. In the larger ring composition of 12:1-40, teaching-debate-teaching, the debate section itself is a ring composition. Even in 2:1-3:6, the middle portion had a two-part rhetorical structure, while the remaining pericopes all had three-part structures.

---

[118] Audience reactions occurred at the end of A and A′ in 2:1-3:6 and at the end of B, C, C′, and B′ in 12:1-40. In 2:1-3:6, the audience reactions might be attributed to the form--healings are frequently followed by an audience response. In 12:1-40, however, the presence of audience reaction cannot be attributed to the form, since neither direct teaching nor pronouncement stories are usually followed by an audience response.

[119] In 4:1-34, the introductions in vv. 26 and 30 are not precisely parallel; and in 12:1-40, the introduction in v. 38 has no parallel at all.

[120] This fact suggests that hook words not closely related to content are more significant than those which are--e.g., "heart" in 2:6,8; 3:5 is more significant than "crowd" in 12:12,37.

[121] Given the multiple rhetorical functions of word repetition--as key words, for anticipation or retrospection, for rhetorical emphasis, in addition to use as hook words--it is not surprising that word repetition should be a secondary consideration in identifying extended rhetorical patterns.

The rhetorical structure of the initial element in a rhetorical pattern may also be a useful indicator. The elegant symmetrical pattern of 4:1-2a, the introduction to the parable discourse, may suggest to the reader that the entire discourse may be so structured. The use of the frame-interposition technique in 2:1-12 may prepare the reader for the use of the same device in 1:45-3:8 as a whole. Finally, the employment of a concentric rhythm in Mark 1:1-8, the opening of the gospel, may alert the reader to the possible use of such patterns later in the gospel.

Second, when a rhetorical pattern elucidates the meaning or function of otherwise obscure passages, then this fact is useful supporting evidence for the existence of the pattern. Examples of this would be the function of v. 6 in Mark 1:1-8, the meaning and function of 2:25-26 in 2:1-3:6, and the role of the public debates and the attached teachings against the scribes in 12:1-40. This type of argumentation, however, should be used with caution, and the critic should be wary of imposing a pattern on a text in order to explain an element which is obscure.

---

[122] This fact is of fundamental methodological importance for the rhetorical or literary critic interested in structure. It means that any attempt to determine larger rhetorical structures or the overall structure of a work should be based upon an analysis of the structure of the smaller units making up the whole. If Mourlon Beernaert in his study of 2:1-3:6 and Lambrecht in 4:1-34 had paid attention to the structure of the individual units of their texts, the difficulties in

Mark 1:21-45(2:12): A passage without a concentric structure

A second method of approaching the question of criteria for identifying concentric patterns is to look at a text which exhibits parallels of content, form, structure, and contains word repetitions, but which does not appear to be symmetrically patterned. Since two conflicting symmetrical patterns have been proposed for Mark 1:21-45 (2:12), indicating an abundance of parallels, it seems a good passage to select. Also, the preceding analysis of 2:1-3:6 has indicated many rhetorical interconnections between 2:1-3:6 and 1:16-45. A consideration of the function of 2:1-3:6 in the gospel of Mark must take into consideration its relationship to Mark 1. The following discussion of structure in Mark 1:21-45(2:12) will help to prepare for the discussion of the relationship of 2:1-3:6 to Mark 1.

D. Dideberg and P. Mourlon Beernaert have proposed a seven-part symmetrical pattern for Mark 1:21-45.[123] D. Clark has proposed a five-part symmetrical pattern for Mark 1:21-2:12.[124] The respective proposals may be outlined as follows:

---

their respective rhetorical patterns might have been avoided. See above, pp. 240-245, 260, fns. 64, 65.

[123] "Jesus vint," pp. 314-317. [124] "Criteria," pp. 66-71.

Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert			Clark
A	1:21-27	Healing of man with unclean spirit in synagogue.	A
B	1:28	Report of Jesus in all of Galilee.	
C	1:29-31	Healing of Simon's mother-in-law.	B
D	1:32-34	Entire village at door; sick and demoniacs healed.	
C′	1:35-38	Departure of Jesus alone; four companions find Jesus; Jesus' mission to preach	C
B′	1:39	The coming of Jesus into all Galilee.	
A′	1:40-45	Healing of the leper	B′
	2:1-12	Healing of the paralytic	A′

The two patterns are not compatible. According to Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert, 1:21-27 is parallel to 1:40-45. According to Clark, the same verses parallel 2:1-12, while 1:29-34 parallels 1:40-45. For Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert, the central or pivot section is 1:32-34 (part of Clark's parallel to 1:40-45). For Clark, the middle portion is 1:35-39. Here it is not a question of a symmetrically structured unit being part of a larger rhetorical unit as in Mark 1:1-8 or 4:3-20. Nor is it a question of overlapping rhetorical patterns as in Mark 11-12 in which 12:1-12 serves both as the climax to the unit, 11:15-18,27-12:12,and as the beginning of the unit, 12:1-40. The two proposed patterns are in conflict with each other. Both cannot be true, and the fact that scholars have found enough evidence of parallelism to propose the two contradictory structures suggests the possibility that neither is the rhetorical pattern of the text. A consideration of the weaknesses and strengths of the arguments for the respective structures and the way in which arguments fail to be convincing should shed light on the question of how to identify symmetrical patterns. The two proposed symmetrical patterns will be discussed separately.

1:21-45: Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert. The markan text does not support the proposed rhetorical pattern of Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert. First, 1:21-45 is not established as a rhetorical unit or sub-unit in the gospel. If the theme is Jesus′ arrival in Galilee, as the title of their article suggests, then one would expect the rhetorical unit to begin at 1:14: ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τῆν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, a verse relevant in content and with strong verbal parallels to 1:39, the proposed B′. Or if 1:14-15 are considered transition verses concluding the prologue and outside the rhetorical structure of the public ministry, the question must still be addressed as to whether or not the calling of the first disciples (1:16-20), Jesus′ first act in Galilee, is or is not part of the following rhetorical unit. The extent of a rhetorical unit needs to be argued on rhetorical grounds.[125]

---

[125] The only argument presented for the rhetorical unity of 1:21-45 is that 1:21 and 1:45 are an inclusio based on the parallels of Καφαρναύμ/πόλιν, εἰσελθῶν/εἰσελθεῖν, ἦν/ἦν ("Jésus vint," p. 316). The inclusio appears unconvincing.

Second, some of the parallels adduced to argue for a symmetrical pattern do not appear to support such a pattern. A and A′ (1:21-27, 40-45) are indeed similar in form--both are healing miracles. They also have similarities in content: in the first, a man with an *unclean* spirit is healed; in the second a leper is *cleansed*.[126] The parallelism of A and A′ seems in itself tenable.[127] However, looking at the entire passage, Jesus′ healing activity does not fit the proposed symmetrical pattern. A, C and A′ recount specific healing; D reports many healing, B′ reports that Jesus cast out demons throughout Galilee, while B and C′, the second and fifth elements, do not refer to healing at all.

B and B′ are similar in content and word repetition. In B, the report of Jesus ἐξῆλθεν...εἰς ὅλην...τῆς Γαλιλαίας (1:28). In B′, Jesus ἦλθεν κηρύσσων...εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν (1:39). B′ is certainly likely to recall B to the reader′s mind, but it also would recall 1:14. Furthermore, the verb "to preach," an important word for Mark,[128] occurs not only in 1:14 and B′ but also in C′ and A′ (1:38,45). Other word repetitions also occur in the text. For example, εὐθύς occurs in 1:18,20,21,23,28,29,30,42,43. It does not occur at all in sections D, C′ or B′.[129] 'Εκβάλλω occurs in D, B′ and A′ (1:34,39,43). Word repetition is used in Mark for many rhetorical purposes, as hook words indicating structure, as key words indicative of theme but not structure, and also for rhetorical emphasis. If it is to be argued that certain word repetitions are functioning as hook words, all repetitions of words must be considered and evaluated to see in what way the repetition is functioning.[130] Dideberg′s and Mourlon Beernaert′s use of "coming into all of Galilee" as hook words does not take into consideration all the relevant data in the text.

---

[126] Farrer (*Mark*, p. 65) also notes the parallel between unclean man and unclean spirit.

[127] In addition, silence is imposed in both A and A′ and in the center, D. The imposition to silence in A is the actual exorcism formula (as in 4:39) and not a command to secrecy as in D and A′ (1:25,34,45). In spite of this difference, the commands to silence would be a strong argument for the pattern *if* the symmetrical pattern as a whole with vv. 32-34 as a central unparalleled unit were tenable.

[128] Schweizer, "Anmerkungen," pp. 36-37; Gaston, *Horae*, pp. 20, 58.

The parallel between C and C′ (1:29-31,35-38) is posited on the grounds of the frequency of verbs of motion--which are frequent throughout the passage being studied--and the presence of the disciples as active characters in both. In C, they tell Jesus of Simon′s mother-in-law′s illness; in C′, they seek out Jesus in desert places. The parallel is valid as far as it goes. But there does not appear to be an overall symmetrical pattern based on character roles. The crowd is an important character in A and D. In A′, however, the crowd is not a character in the healing narrative, and only begins to gather at the end as the result of the healed leper′s preaching. Furthermore, C and C′, except for the presence of the disciples, are in no way parallel in content: in one, a specific healing is recounted; in the other, the disciples seek out Jesus to tell him everyone is looking for him.[131]

---

[129] Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert do note the frequency of "immediately" but only as an indication of the "dynamic movement" of the text. ("Jésus vint," p. 312). They do not consider its possible relationship to structure, or address themselves to the question of why it does not occur at all in 1:32-39.

[130] See above, pp. 235-237.

In 1:21-45, Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert have not shown any consistent overall symmetrical pattern based on content (or form). The parallelism of the various sections is posited on the basis of different criteria. A and A′ are parallel on the basis of content, healing--the exorcism of an unclean spirit and the cleansing of the leper.[132] The parallelism of B and B′ is based on the presence of word repetition and the fact that both are general notations, not particular scenes.[133] The parallelism of C and C′ is based on character roles--the presence of the disciples. It would seem, however, that a symmetrical structure, to be posited in the text, should show a (symmetrical) alternation in the text based consistently on at least one major criterion.[134] Moreover, the pattern posited does not exhibit *congruent* parallelisms based on content *and/or* form *or* structure *or* character roles *or* setting.[135] It would seem that an extended concentric structure consisting of several pericopes should exhibit at least some congruent parallelisms based on more than one criterion.

---

[131] Another and serious problem with the proposed structure is that B and B′ have been separated from their respective pericopes (A and C′) so that the overall rhetorical pattern conflicts with the obvious literary divisions within the pattern, the pericope units. (A similar problem was noted in Mourlon Beernaert′s analysis of 2:1-3:6. See above, pp. 242-245.

[132] Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert do not employ the criterion of form critical similarity. Several of the similarities they posit between A and A′ are in fact characteristics of the healing form ("Jésus vint," p. 315). They also argue for a similarity in structure, each a healing with three principle parts (Ibid.). In discussing Clark′s pattern, it will be argued that the parallelisms of structure are greater between 1:21-28 and 2:1-12.

[133] "Jésus vint," p. 316. If the distinction between general notations and particular scenes is to be observed, 1:45b should be separated from its pericope as another general notation.

[134] It has been noted several times previously that symmetrical patterns often contain asymmetrical elements (e.g., the Son of man in

1:21-2:12. Clark. Building upon my proposed concentric structure for 2:1-3:6,[136] Clark has proposed a "double pyramid chiasm" as follows:[137]

1:21-28	A1		
1:29-34		B1	
1:35-39			C
1:40-45		B2	
2:1-12	A2		
2:13-17		D1	
2:18-22			E
2:23-28		D2	
3:1-6	A3		

Thus Clark views 1:21-2:12 and 2:1-3:6 as two overlapping concentric

---

2:1-3:6). However, for an element to stand out as asymmetrical, the overall symmetry must first be demonstrated.

[135] Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert do note that 1:21-34 occur within Capernaum, while 1:35-45 occur elsewhere in Galilee in both towns and desert places ("Jésus vint," p. 312). This suggests that D, the last scene in Capernaum, should be treated as part of the first stage of the narrative rather than as a transition between the two stages (Ibid., p. 315). The fact that the last scene in Capernaum and the first scene outside of it each begin with elaborate time indications may indicate a major break between vv. 34 and 35 (1:32,35).

[136] Dewey, "Structure;" Clark, "Criteria," p. 63.

[137] "Criteria," pp. 66-71. The sections have been relettered to facilitate the discussion. Also, what Clark labels "chiasm" is more appropriately labelled "concencntric" or "symmetrical structure" and is so referred to in the discussion.

patterns in which A1 and A2 form the outer ring of the first pattern, and A2 and A3 the outer ring of the second.[138] As may be seen from the use of different letters (B1,C,B2; D1,E,D2), Clark does not view the middle parts of the two concentric patterns as interrelated. The second concentric pattern, 2:1-3:6, is the pattern proposed in chapter four of this study and need not be considered here. The parallelism of the "A" layer (1:21-28; 2:1-12; 3:1-6) and the proposed symmetrical pattern of 1:21-2:12 will be evaluated.

Clark's argument for the parallelism of A1, A2 and A3 seems viable.[139] The settings are comparable: A1 is set at Capernaum, in a synagogue (1:21); A2 is set a Capernaum (2:10); and A3 is set in a synagogue (3:1).[140] (Clark's argument may be buttressed by the fact that the πάλιν's in both 2:1 and 3:1 refer back to 1:21.) All three recount healings accomplished by word alone. All three--and only these healings in 1:21-3:6—are followed by an audience reaction to the miracle. There is also a partial overlap of hook words among the three pericopes. All three include the introductory phrase εἰσῆλθεν εἰσελθὼν εἰς (1:21; 2:1; 3:1).[141] A1 and A2 are linked by "authority" (1:22,27; 2:10); A2 and A3 by "sabbath."

---

[138] In addition, Clark has posited an "X" layer standing outside of the pyramidal structure which he labels a "ladder parallelism." It consists of X1, 1:16-20; X2, 2:13-14; and X3, 3:7-12 (Ibid., pp. 68-69). Clark argues, correctly, that concentric symmetry is only one type of a general literary phenomenon which may be called "recursion," and that "different types of recursion may interpenetrate each other" (Ibid., p. 69, italicized). Clark's conclusions about recursion appear valid, as may be seen in the rhetorical structure of Mk 11-12 (see above, pp. 266-269). His proposed "X" layer, however, does not seem rhetorically sound. The major difficulty is that X1 and X2 are more closely related in content to 3:13-19, the choosing of the twelve, than to X3, 3:7-12, which appears to be a continuation of 1:45 (see above, pp. 190-192).

[139] "Criteria," pp. 69-70. Koch (Wunderzählungen, pp. 42-55) argues for a close connection theologically between these three pericopes on the grounds of markan redactional additions and ordering of materials. The fact that Clark on literary grounds and Koch on redactional grounds both group the same three miracles suggests that they may be correct (i.e., the criterion of multiple methodologies).

[140] Pesch (Naherwartungen, p. 57) notes that Jesus' public work in the first section of the gospel begins and ends in a synagogue.

Clark's argument for the parallelism of 1:21-28, 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 may be strengthened by additional parallelisms. In 1:21-28 as well as in 2:1-12 and 3:1-6, there is conflict involving dialogue: in A1, between Jesus and the demon; in A2 and A3, between Jesus and the opponents.[142] 1:21-28, like 2:1-12 and 3:1-6, is a ring composition in structure. The actual exorcism is framed at the beginning and end by similar audience reactions: amazement at Jesus' teaching with authority (1:22,27). In the three pericopes, there is a progressive shift in the third character role in the narrative--the character in addition to Jesus and the person being healed. In 1:21-28, the third character throughout is the crowd, the people in the synagogue, who are favorably impressed by Jesus. In 2:1-12, the third character in the outer ring at the beginning and the end is still the friendly crowd, while in the central portion, the third character is played by the hostile opponents. In 3:1-6, the third character role throughout is that of the hostile opponents.[143] There is a movement from the popularity of Jesus to the opposition to him.

---

[141] Εἰσελθὼν in 1:21 is textually uncertain.

[142] J.M. Robinson (History, pp. 44-45) appears correct in his observation of the similarity of form between the exorcisms and the controversy apophthegms: "The demon advances upon Jesus with a hostile challenge, only to be silenced by an authoritative word of Jesus."

Moreover, 1:21-28 (A1) and 2:1-12 (A2) have additional parallels. The mention in A1 by the crowd that Jesus teaches with authority unlike the scribes prepares the reader for the objection by the scribes in A2 to Jesus' claim to have authority to forgive sins (1:22; 2:6-10a). The concluding audience reaction in A1 takes no cognizance of the demon's recognition of Jesus as "the holy one of God" just as the crowd reaction in A2 takes no cognizance of Jesus' claim to be the Son of man with authority on earth (1:27; 2:12). Finally, it is possible that ἀπολέσαι/ἀπολέσωσιν in 1:24 and 3:6 may be an additional connection between A1 and A3.[144] Jesus indeed has come to destroy the demons; the Jewish authorities will destroy

---

[143] Pesch (Naherwartungen, p. 57) notes that the antithetical audience reactions in 1:21-28 and 3:1-6 emphasize the contrast between the two scenes. Clark, on the other hand, sees the movement as one from puzzlement or mystification in 1:21-28 to polarization for or against Jesus in 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 ("Criteria," p. 69). While Clark (Ibid.) is correct in emphasizing the necessity of choice for or against Jesus (for Jesus' audience, Mark's audience and for ourselves), the audience reaction in 1:21-28 would seem to be wholeheartedly favorable, both from its explicit content, and from the facts that as a consequence of Jesus' activity, word of Jesus spread throughout all of Galilee, and at the end of the Sabbath, the whole town gathers around Jesus (1:28,34).

[144] 'Απόλλυμι is also used in the middle voice, in the sense of "be lost" in 2:22.

Jesus, bringing about their own destruction in turn (12:9).[145]

There would appear to be sufficient evidence based on structure, content (setting and character roles) and hook words to posit some connection or parallelism between A1, A2 and A3. Luke apparently recognized some interrelationship of the three pericopes for he inserts the phrase εἰς τὸ μέσον from A3 not only into A2 but also into A1 (Lk 4:35; 5:19; 6:8). These are the only uses of the phrase in Luke.

Clark's argument for a concentric pattern in 1:21-2:12, however, does not seem viable. The parallelism of 1:29-34 and 40-45 (B1 and B2) seems strained and the setting apart of 1:35-39 as the middle element is debatable. Clark argues for the parallelism of B1 and B2 as follows:[146] in both, a specific healing occurs (Simon's mother-in-law and the leper); in both, "Jesus as a result is overwhelmed by crowds" (1:33,45); and in both, there is a demand for silence (1:34,44). In addition, the hook words χείρ and ἐξέβαλεν are to be noted (1:31,41; 34,43)

In his arguments, Clark has paid insufficient attention to content as distinct from form. The first part of B1 (1:29-31) and B2 as a whole report specific healings. There, however, the similarity of the two healings ends. In B1, the healing is a "raising," a resurrection-type miracle; there is no dialogue; and the disciples play a role. In B2, the healing is a cleansing, there is considerable dialogue; and for the healing proper, there are no characters except Jesus and the leper. The use of "hand" in both miracles may simply be a commonplace of the healing form.[147] In content, the healing of the leper (B2) is closer to the exorcism (A1) as Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert have argued; and the cure of Simon's mother-in-law (B1) to the raising of the paralytic (A2)[148] than either is to each other. The similarity of form-critical type--a healing--is not sufficient to posit parallelism.

---

[145] Thus I would agree with Best (*Temptation*, pp. 18-29, 189) that the temptation represents Jesus' victory over Satan against Robinson's (*History*, pp. 30-32) argument that the temptation is the introductory confrontation. See also Howard Clark Kee, "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories," *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 242-246.

[146] "Criteria," p. 70. Clark's argument that the healings are described similarly (ἀφῆκεν αὐτνη ὁ πυτερός, ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, 1:31,42) appears to be due to the miracle form. See 3:5: ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

Furthermore, as Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert recognized, B1 consists of two independent scenes, the private specific healing and the multiple public healings (1:29-31,32-34). The presence of the crowd in the second scene is not, as Clark asserts, a consequence of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law, but of the events in the synagogue in A1. The injunction to silence to the leper in B2 (1:44) is a direct command to the leper to keep quiet (similar to the command to silence the demon in A1). The injunction to silence in B1 is not part of the specific healing, but an aside to the reader at the close of the scene of multiple healings (1:34). The parallelism of B1 and B2 cannot be maintained.

---

[147] Mark uses the exact phrase κρατήσας τῆς χειρός in 1:31, 5:41 and 9:27. Furthermore, touching or laying on of hands by the healer is a typical method of healing (1:41, 5:23; 6:2,5; 7:35; 8:23). Finally in B2, Jesus stretches out his hand (1:41); in A3, Jesus commands the man to stretch out his withered hand and he does so. These are the only three uses of "to stretch out" in Mark. They may be another of the many instances of interweaving of material in Mark 1:16-3:6.

[148] Both take place in a house in Capernaum, probably Simon's house, and both are resurrection-type miracles employing the verb, ἔγειρω. This parallelism is stressed by Farrer, *Mark*, pp. 65-66, and Radermakers, *Bonne nouvelle*, Vol. 2, p. 92.

Finally, the middle element (C, 1:35-39) is not clearly set apart from the other elements in the symmetrical pattern (as the central element was set off in the symmetric patterns described earlier: 1:4-5; 2:18-22; 4:21-25; and either 12:13-34 or 18-27). Contra Clark,[149] 1:35-39 does not differ from the other pericopes in its concentric pattern by the absence of miracles (Jesus casts out demons in 1:39) nor by a distinctive setting (Jesus is in a desert place in 1:35 and in 1:40-45). Thus, while the parallelism of A1 and A2 may be maintained, the symmetrical arrangement of the material between them, 1:29-45, cannot be maintained.

Clark's methodology appears to be at fault in that he does not distinguish clearly between content per se and form, which inevitably involves some parallelism of content--e.g., a healing form necessarily reports a healing but the type of healing and the way it is told may vary greatly In addition, Clark's practice of his methodology is sometimes weak or erroneous. A closer reading of the text would have enabled Clark to see that the gathering of the crowd in 1:32-34 was the consequence of 1:21-28, not the private healing in 1:29-31, and to see the connections between C and the other pericopes in the section.

---

[149] "Criteria," p. 70.

Summary. Neither Dideberg's and Mourlon Beernaert's analysis nor Clark's seems sufficient to posit a symmetrical pattern in the text of 1:21-45(2:12). All rhetorical units in the gospel of Mark are not concentrically structured or organized.[150] Yet both of their proposals have pointed out many parallels which exist in the text, awareness of which may enrich the reader's experience of the text. Further, Clark's analysis (and the critique of it) have stressed parallels between 1:21-45 and 2:1-3:6 in addition to the retrospective references already noted in the first reading of 2:1-3:6 in chapter three. In particular, Clark's recognition of the relationship of 1:21-28; 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 appears valid.

Conclusion

The failure of both proposed symmetrical patterns in Mark 1-2 to be convincing reaffirms the conclusions reached on the basis of the criteria used to establish the proposed symmetrical patterns in 1:1-8; 2:1-3:6; 4:1-34 and 12:1-40.[151] Neither proposal for Mk 1:21-45(2:12) shows a clear symmetrical alternation on the basis of manifest content. Neither has a congruent shift of form and content. Neither takes into consideration the rhetorical structure of the individual elements of the overall pattern.[152] Finally, neither helps to elucidate the meaning or purpose of otherwise obscure passges.

---

[150] Of the extended passages considered in this dissertation, 1:1-15, the Jerusalem public ministry as a whole, and 11:15-18,27-12:12 as well as Mark 1:21-45(2:12) were not found to be symmetrically patterned.

[151] See above, pp. 291-297.

In addition to the above, the respective proposals have two weaknesses in common. First, neither argument pays adequate attention to the criterion of form. Dideberg and Mourlon Beernaert basically ignore form as a possible indication of parallelism and as a result posit some strange parallels, e.g., the specific healing in 1:29-31 with the biographical apophthegm in 1:35-38. Clark, on the other hand, treats the elementary similarity in form of 1:29-31 and 1:40-44 as a real similarity in content which the respective verses do not support. The observation of Muilenberg that rhetorical criticism builds upon the results of form criticism would appear to be vindicated.[153]

Secondly, both proposals fail to consider all the relevant data, all the possible parallelisms in the text. While all possible interrelationships are not significant for identifying rhetorical structure, they must be considered and accounted for in the determination of a rhetorical pattern. The pattern of specific and general healings, the type and manner of each healing, the alternation of specific scenes and general notations, setting and temporal notations, character roles (disciples, crowd), and audience reaction need to be analyzed throughout the entire passage. Particularly in the determination that an instance of word repetition is functioning as a hook word, all word repetitions within a passage need to be considered. The existence of some symmetrical parallelisms, when there exist other equally significant conflicting parallelisms, is not sufficient to posit a concentric pattern in the text.

---

[152] The material presents many rhetorical clues. For example, 1:32-34 and 1:39 as well as 1:21-28 are ring compositions. 1:35-38 and 1:40-45 are marked by inclusios. The opening act of Jesus' ministry, the double or parallel call of disciples (1:16-20) may perhaps suggest that the remainder of Mk 1 consists of two parallel sections--three scenes in Capernaum (1:21-28,29-31,32-34) and three scenes outside of Capernaum (1:35-38,39, 40-45).

[153] See above, pp. 15-16.

Finally, in a discussion of criteria or methdology for identifying concentric patterns, a point made earlier should be recalled. Rhetorical analysis is an art as well as a science. It depends not only on the evidence of the text and the skill of the rhetorical critic in analyzing the text but also on the sensitivity of the critic to the text.[154] While an adequate methodology for identifying rhetorical patterns may be described, while explicit criteria may be established, the application of the methodology, the weighing of the relative importance of the various arguments, remains dependent upon the ability and sensitivity of the rhetorical critic. Rhetorical criticism, like redaction and form criticism, is not an exact science.

---

[154] See above, pp. 68-69, 237-238.

CHAPTER VI

MARK 2:1-3:6 IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

With chapter five, the rhetorical analysis of selected portions of the gospel of Mark and the discussion of an adequate methodology for determining rhetorical structure, in particular criteria for identifying concentric patterns, have been completed. It is now necessary to return to the subject of the Galilean controversy section, Mark 2:1-3:6, and to consider the redactional question raised in chapter two: is 2:1:3-6 with its elegant concentric and linear pattern a markan construction or is it to be attributed to Mark's interpolation of a source into his narrative? Finally, as a conclusion, there will be a brief summary of the meaning and function of 2:1-3:6 in Mark's gospel.

Is Mark 2:1-3:6 a Markan Construction?

In chapter five, it was concluded that concentric structuring of material, whether by original composition, compilation of independent traditions, or by editorial modification of a collection or source, may be considered one of Mark's literary techniques. However, to observe that 2:1-3:6 is concentrically structured does not in itself prove that the concentric structure is due to Mark. Symmetrical patterning is a rhetorical technique available to compilers of collections or sources as well as to Mark. Also, as noted in chapter two, 2:1-3:6 qualified for consideration as an insertion or interpolation into a larger narrative.[1] The controversy section is set into the frame of 1:45 and 3:7-8, in which there is no hint of opposition and in which 3:7 could follow immediately upon 1:45 without narrative disjunction. The section, _if_ it had a premarkan existence, could have been inserted between 1:45 and 3:7.

Given the tightly-knit linear and concentric structure of 2:1-3:6, it would seem that either Mark created the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 by means of redaction, compilation and/or composition _or_ Mark took over the structure from an earlier source virtually as it now stands.[2] Here, it will be argued that Mark created the structure of 2:1-3:6. It will be argued, first, that the interconnections of Mark 1:16-45 and 2:1-3:6 point towards markan construction of 2:1-3:6; second, that the literary techniques employed to create the structure are frequently markan devices; and third, that the theology brought out by the literary structure appears to be consonant with Mark's theology elsewhere in the gospel. Finally, there will be a brief excursus on the question of whether Mark employed the earlier collection proposed by Kuhn in 2:1-28 or whether he composed 2:1-3:6 from previously independent traditions.

---

[1] See above, p. 98.

[2] Much as Luke adapted the structure from Mark. See above, Mark's source, if any, would be basically that hypothesized by Albertz.

Interconnections between Mark 1:16-45 and 2:1-3:6

Numerous rhetorical and content interconnections of 2:1-3:6 with 1:16-45 were noted in the first reading of 2:1-3:6 in chapter three and also in the discussion of Mark 1:16-45(2:12) at the end of chapter five. If these interconnections are essential to the concentric structure of 2:1-3:6, then 2:1-3:6 with its present rhetorical structure could not have had an independent existence prior to its connection with Mark 1:16-45.

Thus, the first question to be asked is, "can the markan retrospective allusions in 2:1-3:6 be deleted without appreciably marring the rhetorical symmetry?" In order to remove the explicit references to Mark 1:16-45, it is necessary to delete πάλιν in 2:1,13 and 3:1, the introductory scenes in 2:1-2 and 2:13, and the call of Levi in 2:14.[3] The three uses of πάλιν may easily be omitted. The entire introductory scene in 2:1-2 with its refercences to 1:21,29,33,45 could be Mark's elaboration of an existing introduction placing Jesus in a house surrounded by a crowd. The introductory scene in 2:13 also is not necessary. With the deletion of 2:14 as well, pericope B could begin at 2:15.

The removal of 2:14, the call of Levi, however, would destroy much of the parallelism between B and B′ (2:13-17,23-28).[4] If B began at 2:15, it would have a two-part rhetorical structure like C, not a three-part structure like B′. The parallelism of the two three-part structures in which eating is explicitly mentioned only in the central portion of each would be lost. Further, the close of B, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners" (2:17b), would refer only to the question about eating with sinners in 2:16 and not back to the call of Levi at the beginning of B. The parallel with B′ in which the last part, 2:27-28, refers back to the opening in 2:23-24 would also be lost.

---

[3] In order for 2:1-3:6 to be a self-contained independent source, it would also be necessary to delete the prospective references in 3:6 to 12:13 and to Jesus' passion, particularly 15:1-4. These prospective references could be explained as Mark's editorial modification of the source's conclusion.

It has already been argued that 2:14 is a markan construction based on 1:16-20 and not an independent tradition.[5] Moreover, it has been argued that 2:25-26 is a secondary addition to the controvesy over sabbath behavior in B′, functioning not only in its own pericope but as an answer to the question about eating in B.[6] It would seem most probable that 2:14 and 2:25-26 were added at the same time by the redactor as part of the construction of the present concentric pattern. The additions contribute to the parallelism of structure of B and B′. In content, both additions emphasize the role of the disciples (in 2:25-26 through the inclusion of David′s followers). Furthermore, 2:25-26 brings the subject of eating into B′. Discipleship and eating are essential content features of the symmetrical pattern in 2:13-28.

---

[4] Luke has dropped the preceding retrospective references but he kept the call of Levi (Lk 5:27-28).

[5] See above, pp. 156-158. [6] See above, pp. 202-204.

If Mark composed 2:14, or even if Mark added 2:14 from tradition to its present setting as most scholars argue, then it would seem to be Mark who has constructed the symmetrical pattern.[7] In summary, while most of the retrospective references in 2:1-3:6 may be dropped without impairing the symmetrical pattern, 2:14 is an important if not essential element of that pattern.

The interconnection between Mark 1:16-45 and 2:1-3:6 extends beyond the specific retrospective references in 2:1-3:6 to include the motif of Jesus' increasing popularity, which begins in 1:21-28 and is continued into 2:1-15, the theme of Jesus' authority found in 1:27-28 as well as in 2:1-28, and the parallelism of 1:21-28, 2:1-12, and 3:1-6.[8] The motif of Jesus' growing popularity is found most explicitly in 2:1-3:6 in 2:1-2 which, as already noted, may be a markan editorial expansion.[9] On the other hand, the theme of Jesus' authority and the parallelism of 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 are part of the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6. Their connection to Mark 1, however, could be explained on the basis of markan editorial modification of the sabbath exorcism in 1:21-28. Both 1:22 and 27 may well be markan additions to the exorcism.[10] Without those verses, both the theme of Jesus' authority in Mark 1 and the parallel between 1:21-28 and the two healings in 2:1-3:6 would be greatly diminished.

---

[7] In Budesheim's hypothesis of a premarkan *Geschichtsverlauf Jesus* including 1:16-3:19, both 1:16-20 and 2:14 are viewed as premarkan ("Jesus," pp. 203,205). In this case, the structure of 2:1-3:6 could also be premarkan. However, the fact that neither 1:16-20 nor 2:13-28 portray an exaltation of the disciples as θεῖοι ἄνδρες suggests there is no need to posit a premarkan source for 1:16-3:19. See above, p. 226, fn. 55.

[8] On the last, see above, pp. 304-307.

[9] Luke has dropped this motif.

If, however, Mark is inserting a source between 1:45 and 3:7, and has redacted 1:21-28 in such a way as to introduce the theme of Jesus' authority and to make it, like 2:1-12 and 3:1-6, a ring composition, then Mark, the final redactor, has modified his independent traditions to fit his source. It would seem more reasonable to suppose that Mark has redacted both 1:21-28 and the material presented in 2:1-3:6 to serve his own interests. In this case, the thematic and structural interrelationships of 1:16-3:6 would seem to be markan. Therefore, the rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 is in all probability markan as well. Thus, the rhetorical and content interconnections of Mark 1:16-45 and 2:1-3:6 suggest that Mark 2:1-3:6 is a markan construction.

Literary techniques

Taylor has already observed that the vocabulary and style of Mark 2:1-3:6 do not differ from the rest of the gospel of Mark.[11] Further, it has been argued in chapter five that extended concentric structure may be considered a markan literary technique. There seems no reason on literary grounds to suppose that Mark 2:1-3:6 is not markan.

---

[10] Bultmann, History, p. 209.

[11] Mark, p. 101. See also N. Turner, Style, p. 11.

The argument on the basis of literary techniques, however, can be carried further to constitute an argument for markan construction. The concentric pattern in 2:1-3:6 is characterized by an alternation of form (healing controversy with the healing at the end vs. non-healing controversies of the action:objection:vindication type). A symmetrical alternation of form was also observed in 4:1-34 and 12:1-40. As in 12:13-34, so also the middle three pericopes of 2:1-3:6 (2:13-28) constitute in themselves a ring composition in content and structure. Further, the parallel placement of audience reactions which are antithetic in content characterizes both 2:1-3:6 and 12:1-40. In both instances a contrast is made between the crowd which wholeheartedly supports Jesus and the Jewish leaders who desire to destroy him. A fondness for stressing contrast is characteristic of markan style and literary technique.[12]

Moreover, the use of frames to block off sections of the gospel would appear to be a markan literary device used to structure the gospel. The healings in 8:22-26 and 10:46-52 block off the way section. 8:22-26 and 9:14-28 block off the first portion of the way section in which the teaching on discipleship is public, not private, teaching. The two pericopes in which Jesus points to women as good examples (12:41-44; 14:3-9) frame the apocalyptic discourse in Mark 13. Finally, the Jerusalem public ministry is set in a narrative frame in which 13:1-2 might follow 11:11 without narrative disjunction.[13] The last frame is similar in type to the frame around 2:1-3:6, and 11:12-12:44 certainly cannot be considered a source which Mark has interpolated. The frame around 2:1-3:6 would seem to be an instance of Mark's framing technique and need not be explained as an indication of Mark's incorporation of a source.

---

[12] See above, p. 22, 264-265.

[13] On the use of frames in the Jerusalem ministry, see above, pp. 266-269.

Finally, the frame of 1:45 and 3:7-8 showing people streaming to Jesus from everywhere functions rhetorically to block off 2:1-3:6 showing opposition to Jesus from the on-going narrative. By means of the frame-interposition technique, Mark is enabled to continue the narrative without immediately dealing with the death threat of 3:6. Exactly the same rhetorical technique is employed in 2:1-12, the first pericope of the larger interposition. The conflict between Jesus and his opponents over blasphemy in 2:6-10a is interposed into the frame of Jesus' miracle which is enthusiastically received by the crowd in 2:1-5,10b-12. Here also, the use of the interposition-frame technique enables the narrator to continue without dealing immediately with the conflict over blasphemy. The use of the same rather unusual rhetorical technique for the same narrative purpose in 2:1-12 and 1:45-3:8 suggests that the same redactor was responsible for both.[14] Since both frames and interpositions (including intercalations and insertions) are markan literary devices, the redactor would seem to be Mark.

---

[14] One could, of course, argue that the use of the technique in 2:1-12 in the source suggested to Mark the use of the same technique for the section as a whole. However, the unusual nature of the technique which we know to be markan from the intercalations and the fact that the theme of Jesus' popularity with the crowd found in the frame around 2:6-10a appears to be a markan motif in 1:16-3:12 and following,and not a motif of the controversy section in itself suggests that Mark is responsible for the use of the technique in 2:1-12.

Theology

On theological as well as on literary grounds, there seems to be no reason to suppose that Mark 2:1-3:6 cannot be Mark's own redaction of tradition. The theology of 2:1-3:6 does not appear to conflict with the theology of the rest of the gospel; therefore there is no need to hypothesize a source to explain the presence of 2:1-3:6 in Mark. First, Albertz' objections to the markan origin of 2:1-3:6 will be reviewed. Second, since the tight concentric structure of 2:1-3:6 indicates that either Mark incorporated the concentric structure from his source or he created that structure, the theological emphases brought out by that structure will be considered in terms of Mark's interests.

Albertz' objections

As noted earlier, Albertz argued that 2:1-3:6 could not be markan because the use of the title, Son of man, in 2:10 and 28 is not Mark's use of the title and because the allusion to Jesus' death in 2:20 and the mention of the plot against Jesus in 3:6 come too early in Mark's plan.[15]

---

[15] See above, pp. 74-75. Kuhn (Sammlungen, p. 87) also views 2:10,20 and 28 as the result of Mark's use of a collection.

The use of Son of Man. The two uses of the Son of man for Jesus' earthly authority are indeed unique in Mark's gospel. Yet, they do not appear to conflict with Mark's later use of the title.[16] Rather, as argued earlier, they serve the purpose of identifying Jesus as the Son of man for the reader and preparing the reader for the later uses of the title for the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus.[17] Since the title is to be used for the suffering and death of Jesus (8:31; 9:12,31; 10:33-34,45), the redactor of the gospel needs to establish the Son of man as a title for the earthly Jesus, not just for a heavenly figure. 2:10 and 2:28 serve this purpose well. Further, 2:10,28 continue the theme of Jesus' earthly authority begun in 1:22,27.[18] Since the uses of the title point both backwards and forwards in the gospel, there would seem no need to view 2:10,28 as contrary to Mark's christology, and as such, evidence for a source.[19]

---

[16] For scholars who view the use of Son of man in 2:10,28 as consonant with Mark's theology, see above, p. 139, fn. 50.

[17] See above, pp. 218-222.

[18] For scholars who see the emphasis on Jesus' authority as a major theme of 1:16-3:6, see Schweizer (Mark, pp. 7, 75); Pesch (Naherwartungen, pp. 57-58; "Zöllnergastmahl," p. 86; "Eine neue Lehre aus Macht: Eine Studie zu Mk 1, 21-28," Evangelienforschung: Ausgewählte Aufsätze deutscher Exegeten [ed. J.B. Bauer; Grax-Cologne: Styria, 1968], pp. 272-273); Koch (Wundererzählungen, pp. 33,42-55); Perrin, Pilgrimage, p. 117.

[19] This does not mean that Mark necessarily created the sayings in 2:10 and 2:28, but simply that Mark was sufficiently in agreement with the sayings to employ them or to incorporate traditions which enployed them. A related issue is the lack of any secrecy motif in 2:1-3:6. I would agree with Weeden (Mark, p. 65, fn. 20; p. 67, fn. 154) that the title Son of man per se is exempt from the secrecy motif.

The early hints of Jesus' death. Scholars have long viewed Mark 2:1-3:6 as an explanation of how or why Jesus was killed.[20] In 2:20, Jesus alludes to his own death, which he does not explicitly reveal to the disciples until 8:31. In 3:16, the opponents begin to plot to destroy Jesus; the activity of the opponents does not again reach the intensity of 3:6 until 11:18 when the authorities again seek to destroy him. Is the emphasis upon Jesus' coming death in 2:1-3:6 too early in the plan of Mark's gospel, and thus evidence for Mark's incorporation of a source?

The hypothesis of the interpolation of a source would not seem necessary to explain the emphasis upon Jesus' death so early in the gospel of Mark. The theme of opposition to Jesus continues the theme begun in 1:16 of the varied responses to Jesus and the bringing of the kingdom. In 1:14-15, the verses closing the prologue and introducing Jesus' ministry, Jesus announces the coming of the kingdom of God and calls for the people to respond: μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. 1:16-3:6 portrays the arrival of the kingdom in Jesus' authoritative words and deeds, teaching and healing.[21] "Mark creates a new beginning by announcing the arrival and present reality of the Kingdom in Galilee....The beginning of the Kingdom spells the ending of an older order of things."[22] 1:16-3:6 also shows the two responses to the arrival of the kingdom. Five incidents showing the popularity of Jesus (1:21-45) are followed by five scenes which portray the opposition to Jesus (2:1-3:6).[23] The numerous retrospective references in 2:1-3:6 help to interrelate the material of 2:1-3:6 with 1:16-45 and thus to contrast the two responses to Jesus. The enthusiastic response of the disciples who leave everything to follow Jesus (1:16-20; 2:14) and of the crowd who seek Jesus out (1:32-33,37,45; 2:2,13; 3:7-8) is contrasted with the total rejection of Jesus and the kingdom by the Pharisees (3:6).

---

[20] In addition to Albertz, *Streitgespräche*, pp. 6, 14, 107, see also Weiss, *Evangelium*, p. 154; Knox, *Sources*, Vol. 1, p. 8; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 91; Schmid, *Mark*, p. 58; Kuhn, *Sammlungen*, pp. 222-223; Hultgren, "Adversaries," p. 279.

[21] The emphasis in 1:16-3:6 seems to be equally on Jesus' teaching and miracles. So Budesheim, "Jesus," p. 202; Kee, "Exorcism," p. 242. Contra Koch (*Wundererzählungen*, pp. 52-55), the miracles are not subordinated to the teaching.

> The response of the people from the regions around Galilee [3:7-8] is thus set against that of the Pharisees (2:1-3:6). The entire section [1:16-3:12] presents Jesus as teacher, healer-exorcist, and liberator from the Law....This brings about the far-reaching response. ...With this general picture of Jesus' work, Mark is ready to begin the next phase of his gospel story. In this first section, he has presented the Jesus who calls men to discipleship and the responses elicited.[24]

Thus, as narrative, 2:1-3:6 is a fitting continuation of 1:16-45. In both sections, Jesus is presented as the bringer of the kingdom. In the two sections, the two possible responses to Jesus and the kingdom are portrayed: enthusiastic acceptance of Jesus and the new way or the attempt to destroy Jesus and maintain the old way. In terms of the gospel story, Mark has shown in 1:16-3:6 what happened in response to Jesus and his message; in terms of Mark's audience, Mark is calling upon his hearers to side with the disciples/crowd or to side with the opponents, to choose for or against the kingdom.[25]

---

[22] Kelber, Kingdom, p. 23. See also Robinson, History, p. 47; Lane, Mark, p. 91.

[23] Henry B. Carré, "The Literary Structure of the Gospel of Mark," Studies in Early Christianity. (Ed. Shirley Jackson Case; New York: Century, 1928), pp. 105-106, 113-115.

[24] Keck, "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology," JBL 84 (1965) 344-345.

Nor does the information to the reader in 3:6--that the opponents want to destroy Jesus--seem too early in Mark's plan. Mark is an "omniscient narrator."[26] He reveals to his readers at the beginning what the internal audience of his story only learns much later on. For example, the reader is told in 1:1,11 that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God; the disciples only learn this in the middle of the narrative (8:27; 9:7); and the opponents are only told near the end (14:62).[27] Mark 3:6 would seem to be part of the same technique of alerting the reader to facts that are only worked out much later in the plot. By means of 3:6, the reader knows that the Jewish leaders want to destroy Jesus, that Jesus stands under the threat of death. The point is made that the bringing of the kingdom aroused the hostility of the Jewish leaders from the start.[28]

---

[25] Schweizer, Mark, p. 75; Geoltrain, "Violation," p. 72.

[26] Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, The Nature of Narrative (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 51-52.

[27] An ancient audience, accustomed to an omniscient narrator and to familiarity with the general plot, might well interpret the disciples' lack of recognition of Jesus as the Christ until 8:27 as normal narrative technique and not in itself an indication of the disciples' lack of understanding. The indications of the disciples' lack of or misunderstanding are usually quite explicit (e.g., 4:13,40; 8:14-21, 32-33).

Theological emphases of Mark 2:1-3:6

In chapter four, it was argued that awareness (conscious or unconscious) of the symmetrical pattern in 2:1-3:6 helps the reader to realize the role of healing and eating as important elements of Jesus' ministry which served to arouse the implacable hostility of the Jewish authorities, and the theme of life vs. death. If the symmetrical structure is to be attributed to Mark, then one would expect these same ideas or themes to be markan interests and to recur elsewhere in the gospel of Mark. This would seem to be the case.

The role of healing and eating and opposition to Jesus. As described in chapter four, healing and eating both play a prominent role in Mark's presentation of Jesus' proclamation and bringing of the kingdom in 1:14-8:26. Both are an important part of Mark's picture of the life of the kingdom as it is lived in this world.[29] In 3:6, jesus' healing (and eating) behavior are given as the cause of the Pharisees' and Herodians' desire to destroy Jesus. Neither healing nor eating, however, is presented as the cause of Jesus' death in Mark, as the healing of Lazarus is in John. As is brought out in 12:1-40,[30] Mark shows Jesus innocent of all charges except that of being (or claiming to be) the messiah.[31]

---

[28] For scholars who view 3:6 as part of Mark's theological interest, see above, p. 80, fns. 33, 35.

[29] Thus I would agree with Kolenkow ("Beyond Miracles," pp. 157-160) against Weeden (Mark, pp. 55-64, 160-164) that Mark is not arguing against miracle-based power in itself. Healings would appear to fade into the background after 8:26 because Mark is no longer discussing the life of the kingdom, but in 8:27-10:45, the way of the cross, discipleship and service, and in 11-13, the proper understanding of eschatology over against Jewish nationalistic eschatological hopes.

Is, then, the fact that healing (and eating) are used in 2:1-3:6 to demonstrate the opposition to Jesus an argument against the markan provenance of 2:1-3:6? It would seem not. In the first place, in 3:1-6, when the opponents are seeking legal grounds to accuse Jesus, Jesus does not act illegally.[32] The Pharisees have no legal way to accuse him, so they go away to plot against him. Thus, the picture in 2:1-3:6 is similar to that in Mark 11-12. In 2:1-3:6, the opponents object to Jesus' healing and eating behavior which arises out of his messianic status as bringer of the kingdom but find no legal grounds for charging him. In 11:12-12:40, the opponents object to Jesus' prophetic/messianic acts and words in the temple and the parable of the wicked tenants but are unable to find legal grounds for charging him.

Second, both healing (3:22-30) and eating (7:1-23) are the subject of controversies with the Jewish authorities later in the gospel. Healing and eating continue to be foci of conflict.

Third, the confrontation of 2:1-3:6 is recalled in the later confrontations with the authorities. When the representatives of the Sanhedrin fail to arrest Jesus in 12:12, they promptly send the Pharisees and Herodians to try to trap Jesus (12:13), recalling 3:6 to the reader's mind. Furthermore,the Sanhedrin trial recalls the healing of the paralytic in 2:1-12 with its charge of blasphemy (2:7; 14:64). The first and last confrontations of Jesus with the Jewish authorities concern the issue of blasphemy. They also contain the first and last references in the gospel to the Son of man, and the only ones preceded by a verb addressed to the internal audience of the pericope (εἰδῆτε/ ὄψεσθε 2:10; 14:62). Further, the scene before Pilate recalls 3:1-6. The words συμβούλιον and κατηγορέω are repeated (3:2,6; 15:1,3,4).[33] In 3:4, Jesus asks if it is legal to do evil (κακοποιῆσαι). In 15:14, after having heard the charge that Jesus is king of the Jews, Pilate asks the crowd what evil Jesus has done (Τί γὰρ ἐποίησεν κακόν;).[34] In both 3:1-6 and 15:1-15, Jesus appears innocent of any legal charge. Thus in the first healing controversy (2:1-12) and the Sanhedrin trial, Jesus affirms his divine authority or status. In the second healing controversy (3:1-6) and the trial before Pilate, Jesus is portrayed as legally innocent. The two healing controversies in 2:1-3:6 point ahead to the two trials in the passion narrative.

---

[30] See above, pp. 287-288.

[31] Ropes, Synoptic Gospels, p. 11.

[32] Kolenkow, "Healing Controversy," p. 636. See also above, p. 95, fn. 81, p. 188.

---

[33] Kolenkow (Ibid., p. 629) suggests that the use of these two words in 15:1-4 is due to Mark's resumption of the use of a source. Here it is argued that the words serve the rhetorical function in Mark of recalling 3:1-6 to the reader's mind. Given the various parallels between 2:1-12 and 14:55-64 and between 3:1-6 and 15:1-15, it would seem that if Mark used the source proposed by Kolenkow, he has used the source very freely, creating his own rhetorical structure.

[34] It is the only use of κακοποιέω in Mark. Κακός is used elsewhere only in 7:21.

Thus, the healing controversy motif in 2:1-3:6 does not seem out of place in Mark's gospel. The Jewish authorities are shown objecting to Jesus' behavior, whether in healing, eating or temple cleansing, but are unable to find legal grounds against him. Even Pilate, having heard the title, King of the Jews, finds no grounds against him. In Mark, the Jewish authorities arrange to have Jesus put to death because of their refusal to accept his messianic status. In 2:1-3:6, the theme of unjustified opposition to Jesus is introduced, a theme which culminates with Jesus' death on the cross.

The theme of life vs. death. As argued earlier, the concentric structure of 2:1-3:6 places emphasis upon the theme of life vs. death.[35] Jesus' actions to "make alive" result in the opponents' plot to destroy him (3:6). The middle pericope of the structure, 2:18-22, suggests that the new community called by Jesus will continue to exist after Jesus' death, while the new wine brought by Jesus will destroy the old wine skins of Judaism.

The theme of life vs. death recurs in a variety of forms at crucial points in Mark's gospel. In the three passion predictions, the theme of life and death is stated for Jesus. Jesus' announcement of his coming death is coupled with the announcement of his resurrection (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34). In 8:34-9:1, the paradoxical relationship of life and death is stated in relation to discipleship. Mark 8:34-9:1 is the only general or public invitation to discipleship in Mark's gospel and thus serves as an invitation not only for the internal audience of the narrative but also for Mark's readers. First, the reader is told that, if he wishes to follow Jesus, he must deny himself and take up his cross, that is accept the possibility of death (8:34). Then the paradox is stated:

---

[35] See above, pp. 216-218.

> For whoever wants to save his life will lose it; but whoever loses his life for my sake and for the sake of the gospel will save it. For what does it profit a person, to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? For what can a person give in exchange for his life? (8:35-37)

As in the case of the Jewish authorities, one's life or death is related to one's reception of Jesus. Giving up of life is for the sake of Jesus and the gospel (8:35). 8:38 makes it clear that one's ultimate fate depends upon one's present attitudes toward Jesus.[36]

Furthermore, the theme of life vs. death is developed in 11:12-12:40 in much the same way it occurs in 2:1-3:6. The intertwined fates of Jesus and the Jewish authorities/nation implicit in 2:1-3:6 is made explicit in the Jerusalem ministry.[37] The Jewish authorities' rejection of Jesus brings about not only Jesus' death but their own destruction and the destruction of the Jewish nation (11:20; 12:1-9; 13:1-2). In the psalm citation about the rejected stone becoming the head of the corner (12:10-11) and in the statement of the reality of the resurrection (12:26-27), there is assurance of continued or new life for Jesus and others as well.

---

[36] On 8:34-9:1, see Dewey, Disciples, pp. 74-81.

[37] See above, p. 289.

Thus, the theme of life vs. death which is brought out by the symmetric pattern of 2:1-3:6 would not seem foreign to the gospel of Mark.[38] Rather, as in the case of the role of Jesus' healing and eating behavior giving rise to the Jewish authorities' seeking to destroy Jesus, so also the theme of life vs. death in 2:1-3:6 serves as an introduction for the reader to a motif that recurs throughout the gospel. The gospel of Mark might be likened to a musical composition in which motifs are introduced early in the composition are brought forward and developed later in the piece.[39] The fact that the structure of 2:1-3:6 emphasizes themes which again become prominent in the gospel suggests not only that there is no need to hypothesize interpolation of a source to explain the presence of 2:1-3:6 in the gospel, but would even seem to be an argument for markan construction of 2:1-3:6 from traditions available to him.

Summary

The tight rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6 suggests that Mark took over 2:1-3:6 from a source virtually as it now stands, or Mark created the present structure himself. The three separate arguments, the interconnections of Mark 2:1-3:6 with 1:16-45, the literary techniques of 2:1-3:6, and the theological emphases of 2:1-3:6, all individually point towards the markan construction of 2:1-3:6. Taken together, they would seem to demonstrate that the rhetorical structure of Mark 2:1-3:6 is due to Mark, not to a premarkan source.

---

[38] Via, in his structuralist analysis of Mark, argues that "the opposition death/resurrection is the fundamental kernel out of which the narrative as a whole develops" (Kerygma, p. 117) and for Mark, "life comes through death" (Ibid., p. 128). I would agree with Via on the centrality of the death/life theme in Mark, but I would see the theme as more complex and varied than simply life through death.

[39] The same may also be said of the discipleship motif in 2:13-28. See above, pp. 222-227.

Excursus: Did Mark use a shorter controversy collection in constructing 2:1-3:6?

The redactional question raised in this study has been answered: the construction of the Galilean controversy section is due to Mark's editorial activity and not to his interpolation of a source. The issue remains open, however, whether Mark employed Kuhn's proposed collection or whether he constructed the section from traditions, most of which had previously been independent. The issue of the existence of Kuhn's collection is primarily one of the history of the Christian tradition and outside the scope of this study. However, the argument for Kuhn's collection would be strengthened if it can be shown that 2:1-3:6 is more easily explained upon the basis of Mark's use of such a source than on the basis of his use of independent traditions. Two questions appear relevant: first, are the uses of Son of man in 2:10 and 28 more easily accounted for on the hypothesis of Mark's use of Kuhn's collection, and second, is the rhetorical complexity of 2:1-3:6 more easily explained as Mark's development of an earlier collection?

Son of man. As argued in chapter four, the uses of Son of man in 2:1-3:6 function primarily to prepare the way for the later uses of the title in Mark's gospel for the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus. The identification of the title with the earthly Jesus needs to be made before 8:31, if that verse is to be comprehensible to the reader. Further, it was argued that in 2:1-3:6, Mark is not attempting to convince his audience of any particular christology but rather shares the christological assumptions of his audience.

Both arguments suggest that the sayings about the Son of man's authority over sin and the sabbath were traditional sayings not creations of Mark. (If the use of a title is preparing the reader for a later and polemical use of the title, the first use should be one with which the reader is more or less familiar, and which he accepts.) Kuhn's hypothesis of a premarkan collection of 2:1-28 extolling the authority of the Son of man provides a convenient explanation for the provenance of the sayings and the fact that they occur so close together in the gospel.

However, Kuhn's collection is not a necessary explanation for the double occurrence of the title in the sense of earthly authority in 2:1-3:6. Morna Hooker notes that the issue which links all the different types of Son of man sayings in Mark is that of Jesus' authority; the term "can appropriately be used when the authority of Jesus is claimed or accepted, and this is why it is used in conversation with those who follow or challenge him."[40] Perrin suggests that Mark balances the two uses of Son of man in 2:10 and 28 with the two uses of Son of God in 3:11 and 5:7.[41] The use of the title in

---

[40] Son of Man, p. 179.

[41] Pilgrimage, p. 117. Perrin argues that Mark was the first to take the step of linking the authority of Jesus' earthly ministry with

2:10,28 can be explained either on the basis of Mark's use of Kuhn's collection or on the basis of Mark's compilation of tradition.

Rhetorical complexity. Mark 2:1-3:6 has a rhetorical richness and complexity which is greater than that in the other rhetorical structures surveyed in Mark. There is the linear development of the theme of opposition to Jesus, the pattern of sin-fasting-sabbath, the concentric pattern of healing-eating-healing and the chiastic relationship of 2:13-17 and 23-28.

It is perhaps easier to explain the rhetorical complexity of 2:1-3:6 on the basis of Mark's use of a source consisting of 2:3-12 (in the order miracle, controversy, Son of man saying), 15-17a(b?), 18-20, (21-22?), 23-24, 27-28. If Mark was employing Kuhn's proposed source, then he already had the pattern of sin-eating-fasting-sabbath and the motif of opposition to build upon. The issue of sin in regard to forgiveness in 2:1-12 and in regard to associating with tax

---

the Son of man (Ibid.). The rhetorical analyses have shown that the authority of Jesus during his earthly ministry is indeed a markan interest in 1:16-3:6 (see especially 1:21-28; 2:1-12,23-28). If Mark was the first to make the link, then it would appear that Mark has adapted sayings about the heavenly Son of man's authority over Christian praxis. See Minette de Tillese (Secret, pp. 367-368) who argues that 2:10,28 are an anticipation or retrojection of the glory of Easter. That Mark has made the transition between the heavenly authority of the Son of man over Christian praxis to the earthly authority of Jesus could be used as an argument for Kuhn's collection. In that case Mark would have employed a source arguing for the Son of man's authority over the church, and modified it to argue for Jesus' authority in his earthly life. Against this argument, it may be stated that the proposed collection already refers to Jesus' earthly life in his mission to sinners (2:17b, see 1:38) and in the bridegroom image (2:19). It is difficult to distinguish the christology of Kuhn's source from Mark's christology.

collectors in 2:15-17 already present in the collection might suggest the doubling of the sabbath issue by the addition of 3:1-6. The addition of 3:1-6 could be markan since it serves the markan interests of showing Jesus innocent on legal grounds and of developing the life/death theme of 2:1-3:6. The eating-fasting pattern of 2:15-20 may have suggested to Mark the addition of the example of David eating the showbread in 2:25-26 to the first sabbath controversy, creating the concentric pattern of healing-eating-healing in 2:1-3:6. On the whole, the highly-articulated structure of 2:1-3:6 perhaps argues for the existence of Kuhn's source, and Mark's development of it.[42]

The Role of 2:1-3:6 in Mark's Gospel: Conclusion

The meaning of 2:1-3:6 and its role in the gospel of Mark has been discussed in chapter four in terms of the significance of the rhetorical structure for understanding the text of 2:1-3:6 and in this chapter in the course of the argument for the markan provenance of the present rhetorical structure of 2:1-3:6. The linear development of 2:1-3:6 portrays Jesus' triumph over his opponents on the issues of sin, fasting, and sabbath; it stresses, moreover, the implacable and unjustifiable hostility of the Jewish leaders to Jesus' authoritative words and deeds in the bringing of the kingdom. The concentric pattern emphasizes the role of healing and eating as integral aspects of Jesus' ministry which caused his rejection by the opponents. It emphasizes the theme of life/death for Jesus and for his opponents. The structure of the text also helps to elucidate the function of 2:25-26, David eating the showbread, as a justification for Jesus' improper eating behavior. It clarifies the role of the disciples as one derived from and dependent upon the person and mission of Jesus. The rhetorical analysis helps to elucidate the role of the Son of man sayings in 2:10 and 28 as an argument for the authority of Jesus in his earthly ministry and as a preparation for the later uses of the title for the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus.

---

[42] The argument may not be regarded as conclusive, however. The concentric structure of 8:27-9:13 (A,B,C,D,C',B',A') recognized by Lafontaine and Mourlon Beernaert ("Marc 8,27-9,13," pp. 543-561) combined with the repetitive parallelism (A,B,C,D,A',B',C'),which I hope to present at some future date, shows that Mark is capable of considerable rhetorical complexity when combining independent traditions.

In terms of the gospel as a whole, 2:1-3:6 is first of all a continuation and completion of the theme introduced in 1:14-15: Jesus' ministry of word and deed manifesting the coming of the kingdom aroused two antithetical responses among the Jews. 1:14-3:6 serves the function of explaining to Mark's readers his understanding of the meaning of and responses to Jesus' ministry of the inbreaking of the kingdom. It serves as a call to Mark's audience to choose Jesus and the new life of the kingdom or to choose the old way of the Jewish leaders.

2:1-3:6 also functions as an introduction to themes and motifs developed later in the gospel. It lays the groundwork for the later use of the Son of man title. Along with 1:16-20, it presents the basis of the discipleship role as one of enthusiastic response to Jesus and his message and of dependence upon him. It introduces the theme of the Jewish leaders' rejection of Jesus, its basis in their refusal to accept his messianic claim (blasphemy), and the lack of legitimate legal grounds for their rejection. It also introduces the motif of life vs. death which continues to play an important role in the gospel.

Most, although not all, of these conclusions are not new. As noted in the course of this study, most of the conclusions have been advocated by scholars using methodological approaches other than that of rhetorical criticism. The rhetorical analysis of 2:1-3:6 has not led to a radically different understanding of 2:1-3:6. This is to be expected. 2:1-3:6 was selected for analysis in part because it is a section of the gospel of Mark whose meaning appears relatively self-evident, which is not a focus of scholarly debate. The rhetorical approach would seem vindicated as a methodology for studying the text. It serves to confirm the conclusions reached by other methodological approaches.

The rhetorical approach, moreover, not only confirms conclusions reached on other grounds. It helps to discriminate between alternative explanations of the texts; it serves as a control for exegesis. For example, the rhetorical analysis shows that the Son of man saying in 2:10 (and the one in 2:28) should not be interpreted as an aside by Mark to his Christian readers but as part of Jesus' claim to have earthly authority and as part of the explanation for the Jewish' leaders hostility to Jesus. The understanding of the discipleship role as the positive response to Jesus is important for the proper interpretation of the later developments of that role--the disciples' misunderstanding and failure. Further, 2:1-3:6 is not simply an explication of the reasons for and the inevitability of Jesus' death; it is also an introduction of the motif of life vs. death, and the first indication of Jesus' ultimate triumph over his opponents.

What is new, however, as a result of the rhetorical analysis, is the recognition of the ability of Mark as a writer/compiler, the recognition of the extent to which Mark has interwoven the elements of his narrative into a coherent whole. He has not merely concatenated the individual traditions like beads on a string. The interconnection of the narrative is seen within 2:1-3:6. 2:1-12 introduces the themes of Jesus' relation to sin, his authority as Son of man, the paradoxical relation of life and death, and the opposition which Jesus' actions and words aroused. These themes are developed in 2:13-28 and climax in 3:1-6. The concentric and chiastic pattern of 2:1-3:6 further interrelates the material. The same interweaving of content may be recognized in the rhetorical role of 2:1-3:6 in the gospel as a whole. 2:1-3:6 is closely connected to 1:(14)16-45 by means of the rhetorical device of retrospection and by means of the content motifs of the earthly authority of Jesus and the antithetical reactions to his words and deeds. 2:1-3:6 is also related to the later development of the gospel by means of rhetorical anticipation and by the introduction of the themes of the opposition to Jesus and life vs. death.

The recognition of the extensive interweaving of material in the gospel of Mark has important implications for the Biblical critic employing the text of Mark as his data for analysis. For the redaction critic seeking to understand the theology and Sitz im Leben of Mark or the exegete interpreting a passage in Mark's gospel, it means that he/she must take into consideration not only the immediate text under analysis but also its place and function in the larger rhetorical structure in which it is embedded. For instance, the critic studying Mark's understanding of the Son of man must analyze not only the specific Son of man sayings in 2:10a and 28 along with the other Son of man sayings in the gospel. He must also study the rhetorical function of 2:10a in 2:1-12 and of 2:28 in 2:23-28. He must consider their role in 2:1-3:6 and their relationship to what precedes and follows them in the markan narrative. The exegete interested in Mark's understanding of the Son of David may not limit his study to 10:46-52, 11:8-10 and 12:35-37, the specific references to the Son of David. He must also seek to understand how each Son of David reference functions in the larger context of which it forms a part.

Furthermore, the critic interested in the form criticism and tradition history of the text must take into consideration not only the particular text which he is investigating. He must also consider its place in its larger rhetorical context. The details of a pericope are determined by the tradition history of the individual pericope and by its redactional adaptation to fit a larger narrative context. For example, 2:17b, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners," may have been added to balance the pattern of a general proverb followed by a christological saying in 2:27-28 and to call to the reader's mind the previous "I" saying about Jesus' mission in 1:38,rather than to complete its own pericope, 2:(13)15-17. Such extensions complicate the form critic's enterprise. Yet he may welcome the complication of his task, for rhetorical criticiam provides him with another avenue, another means of determining the tradition history of early Christianity and the life of Jesus. It adds to his tools for interpreting the limited data at his disposal.

But perhaps the main value of rhetorical criticism is not to be found in the assistance it provides to the exegete, redaction critic and form critic in their respective tasks. Perhaps its greatest value is in providing Mark's reader--then and now--with a greater feeling for and appreciation of Mark's gospel and its message. There are many questions the rhetorical approach cannot answer. The disciplines of source, form, and redaction criticism will always be needed. However, the literary/rhetorical approach can provide the reader with an insight into Mark's gospel, how he intended it to be read and understood, which none of the more historical approaches can. It is a valuable addition to the tools of the Biblical critic and a valuable approach for the lay reader attempting to grasp Mark's message.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtemeier, Paul J. Mark. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Albertz, Martin. Die synoptischen Streitgespräche. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1921.

Alonso-Schökel, Luis. Estudios de Poética Hebrea. Barcelona: Juan Flors, 1963.

__________. "Poésie Hébraïque," Dictionaire de la Bible: Supplément. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1972. Vol. 8, cols. 49-90.

Ambrozic, Aloysius M. The Hidden Kingdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel. CBQMS 2. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1972.

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Translated by Willard Trask. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957.

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner. The Beginnings of the Gospel Story. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1909.

__________. The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925.

Bailey, K.E. "Recovering the Poetic Structure of I Cor. i 17-ii 2. A Study in Text and Commentary," NovT 17 (1975) 265-296.

Ball, Ivan Jay, Jr. "A Rhetorical Study of Zephaniah." Th.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union (Berkeley), 1972.

Banks, Robert. Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition. SNTSMS 28. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Barré, M.L. "Paul as 'Eschatologic Person': A New Look at 2 Cor. 11:19," CBQ 37 (1975) 500-526.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich from 4th Ger. ed., 1952. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Beardslee, William A. Literary Criticism of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.

Beck, Ingrid. Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik. New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1971.

Bennett, W.J., Jr. "The Herodians of Mark's Gospel," NovT 17 (1975) 9-14.

Bertman, Stephen. "Symmetrical Design in the Book of Ruth," JBL 84 (1965) 165-168.

Best, Ernest. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology. SNTSMS 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Bird, C.H. "Some γαρ-clauses in St. Mark's Gospel," JTS 4 (1953) 171-187.

Blass, F., and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk from 9-10th Ger. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961

Blatherwick, David. "The Markan Silhouette?" NTS 17 (1970-71) 184-192.

Bligh, John. Galatians in Greek. Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966.

Boismard, M.-E. Le prologue de Saint Jean. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1953.

Boobyer, G.H. "Mark II,10a and the Interpretation of the Healing of the Paralytic," HTR 47 (1954) 115-120.

Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bornkamm, Günther. "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. 2d ed. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957. Pp. 85-93.

Bowman, John. The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.

Budesheim, Thomas L. "Jesus and the Disciples in Conflict with Judaism," ZNW 62 (1971) 190-209.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Burkill, T.A. Mysterious Revelation. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963.

__________. New Light on the Earliest Gospel: Seven Markan Studies. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972.

Buschel, Frederick. "κατηγορέω" TDNT. Vol. 3, p. 637.

Cadoux, C.J. "The Imperatival Use of ἵνα in the New Testament. JTS 42 (1941) 165-173.

Carlston, Charles E. The Parables of the Triple Tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Carré, Henry B. "The Literary Structure of the Gospel of Mark," Studies in Early Christianity. Edited by Shirley Jackson Case. New York: Century, 1928. Pp. 105-126.

Ceresko, Anthony R. "The Chiastic Word Pattern in Hebrew," CBQ 38 (1976) 303-311.

Ceroke, C.P. "Is Mark 2:10 a Saying of Jesus?" CBQ 22 (1960) 369-390.

Clark, David J. "Criteria for Identifying Chiasm," Linguistica Biblica 35 (1975) 63-72.

Condamin, Albert. "Symmetrical Repetitions in Lamentations Chapters I and II," JTS 7 (1906) 137-140.

Cranfield, C.E.B. The Gospel According to Saint Mark. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Crossan, John Dominic. "Redaction and Citation in Mark 11:9-10,17 and 14:27." Book of Seminar Papers. Edited by Lane C. McGaughy. SBLASP 108. Society of Biblical Literature, 1972. Vol. 1, pp. 17-62.

Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: Athlone Press, 1956.

__________. "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," NTS 5 (1958-59) 174-187.

__________. "Responsibilities of Master and Disciples in the Gospels," NTS 19 (1972-73) 1-15.

Deeks, David. "The Structure of the Fourth Gospel," NTS 15 (1968-69) 107-128.

Delebecque, É. "Les épis 'égrenés' dans les Synoptiques," Revue des Études Grecques 88 (1975) 133-142.

Delorme, J. "Aspects doctrinaux de second Évangile. Études récentes de la redaction de Marc." De Jésus aux Évangiles. Edited by I. de La Potterie. BETL 25:2. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1967. Pp. 42-74.

Dewey, Joanna. "The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2:1-3:6," JBL 92 (1973) 394-401.

__________. Disciples of the Way: Mark on Discipleship. Women's Division, Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church, 1976.

Dibelius, Martin. "The Structure and Literary Character of the Gospels," HTR 20 (1927) 151-170.

__________. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Scribners, 1935.

Dideberg, D., and Mourlon Beernaert, P. "Jésus vint en Galilée," NRT 98 (1976) 306-323.

Di Marco, Angelico. "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel: 1. Teil," Linguistica Biblica 36 (1975) 21-97.

__________. "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel: 2. Teil," Linguistica Biblica 37 (1976) 49-68.

__________. "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel: 3. Teil," Linguistica Biblica 39 (1977) 37-85.

Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Zur Erzählerkunst des Markus," ZNW 27 (1928) 193-198.

Dodd, C.H. "The Dialogue Form in the Gospels," BJRL 37 (1954-55) 54-67.

Doeve, Jan Willem. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.

Donahue, John R. "Tax Collectors and Sinners," CBQ 33 (1971) 39-61.

__________. Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark. SBLDS 10. Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature for the Seminar on Mark, 1973.

Doudna, John Charles. The Greek of the Gospel of Mark. SBLMS 12. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1961.

Duckworth, George E. "The Architecture of the Aenied," American Journal of Philology 75 (1954) 1-15.

__________. Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962.

Easton, Burton Scott. "A Primitive Tradition in Mark," Studies in Early Christianity. Edited by Shirley Jackson Case. New York: Century, 1928. Pp. 85-101.

Elliott, John H. "Man and the Son of Man in the Gospel According to Mark." Humane Gesellschaft. Edited by Trutz Rendtorff and Arthur Rich. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970. Pp. 47-59.

Farrer, Austin. A Study in St Mark. London: Dacre Press, 1951.

___________. St Matthew and St Mark. London: Dacre, 1954.

Faw, D.C.E. "The Outline of Mark," JBR 25 (1957) 19-23.

Fenton, John C. "Destruction and Salvation in the Gospel According to St. Mark," JTS 3 (1952) 56-58.

___________. "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew," Studia Evangelica. International Congress on New Testament Studies. Edited by Kurt Aland, et al. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959. Vol. 73, pp. 174-179.

Forster, E.M. Aspects of the Novel. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1927.

Francis, Fred O. "The Baraita of the Four Sons." Book of Seminar Papers. Edited by Lane C. McGaughy. SBLASP 108 Society of Biblical Literature, 1972. Vol. 1, pp. 245-284.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. New York: Atheneum, 1967.

Frye, Roland Mushat. "A Literary Perspective for the Criticism of the Gospels." Jesus and Man's Hope. Edited by Donald G. Miller and Dikran Y. Hadidian. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary (A Perspective Book), 1971. Vol. 2, pp. 193-221.

Gaechter, Paul. Die literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium. SBS 3. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966.

UMI

Gamba, Giuseppe G. "Considerazioni in margine alla poetica di Mc 2,1-12," Salesianum 28 (1966) 324-349.

Gaston, Lloyd. Horae Synopticae Electronicae: Word Statistics of the Synoptic Gospels. SBLSBS 3. Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.

Geoltrain, Pierre. "La violation du Sabbat: Une lecture de Marc 3, 1-6," Foi et Vie 69 (1970) 70-90.

Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory and Manuscript. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. Uppsala: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1961.

Giblin, Charles Homer. "Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthaean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii.57-xxviii. 20)," NTS 21 (1974-75) 406-420.

Good, Edwin M. Irony in the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

Grob, Rudolf. Einführung in das Markus-Evangelium. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1965.

Grobel, Kendrick. "A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2." Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Edited by Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1964. Pp. 255-261.

Gros Louis, Kenneth R.R., ed. Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives. With James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974.

Grundmann, Walter. Das Evangelium nach Markus. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.

Hägg, Thomas. Narrative Techniques in Ancient Greek Romances. Stockholm: Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, 1971.

Haenchen, Ernst. Der Weg Jesu. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.

Hawkins, John C. Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem. 2d. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

Hay, Lewis S. "The Son of Man in Mark 2:10 and 2:28," JBL 89 (1970) 69-75.

Hirsch, Eric D., Jr. Validity in Interpretation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Hobbs, Edward C. "The Gospel of Mark and the Exodus." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1952.

___________. "A Different Approach to the Writing of Commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels," A Stubborn Faith: Papers on Old Testament and Related Subjects Presented to Honor William Andrew Irwin. Edited by Edward C. Hobbs. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1956. Pp. 155-163.

Hooker, Morna D. The Son of Man in Mark. London: SPCK, 1967.

Hultgren, Arland J. "Jesus and his Adversaries: A Study of the Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition." Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary (New York), 1971.

___________. "The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mark 2:23-28," JBL 91 (1972) 38-43.

Jackson, Jared J., and Kessler, Martin. Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series No. 1. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1974.

Jeffrey, Arthur. "Daniel," Interpreter's Bible. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. Vol. 6, pp. 341-549.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jesus als Weltvollender. BFCT 33:4. Gütersloh: G. Mohr, 1930.

Johnson, Sherman E. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.

Keck, Leander E. "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology," JBL 84 (1965) 341-358.

___________. "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel," NTS 12 (1965-66) 352-370.

Kee, Howard Clark. "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories," NTS 14 (1967-68) 232-246.

__________. Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.

Kelber, Werner H. The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

__________, ed. The Passion in Mark. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

UMI

Kilpatrick, G.D. "Some Notes on Marcan Usage," The Bible Translator 7 (1956) 2-9, 51-56, 146.

Kittel, Bonnie Pedrotti. "The Composition of the Hodayot of Qumran." Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union (Berkeley), 1975.

Klostermann, Erich. Das Markusevangelium. 4th ed. HNT. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950.

Knigge, Hans-Dieter. "The Meaning of Mark," Int 22 (1968) 53-70.

Knox, Wilfred L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. Vol. I: St. Mark. Edited by H. Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Koch, Dietrich-Alex. Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangelium. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975.

König, Eduard. Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Literatur. Leipzig: Dieterichtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Theodor Weicher, 1900.

Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham. "Beyond Miracles, Suffering and Eschatology." 1973 Seminar Papers. Edited by George MacRae. SBLASP 109. Society of Biblical Literature, 1973. Vol. 2, pp. 155-202.

___________. "Healing Controversy as a Tie between Miracle and Passion Material for a Proto-Gospel," JBL 95 (1976) 623-638.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. 14th rev. ed. Founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm; translated by A.J. Mattill, Jr. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1966.

Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium. SUNT 8 Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971.

Lafontaine, René, and Mourlon Beernaert, Pierre. "Essai sur la structure de Marc, 8,27-9,13," RSR 57 (1969) 543-561.

Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. Évangile selon Saint Marc. 5th ed. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1929.

Lamarche, Paul. Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure littéraire et messianisme. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1961.

__________. "Commencement de l'évangile de Jésus, Christ, Fils de Dieu (Mc 1,1)," NRT 92 (1970) 1024-1036.

UMI

__________. "The Call to Conversion and Faith: The Vocation of Levi (Mk 2, 13-17)," Lumen Vitae 25 (1970) 301-312.

__________. "Structure de l'épître aux Colossiens," Bib 56 (1975) 453-463.

Lambrecht, Jan. Die Redaktion des Markus Apokalypse. AnBi 28. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.

__________. "La structure de Mc. XIII." De Jésus aux Évangiles. Edited by I. de La Potterie. BETL 25:2. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1967. Pp. 141-164.

__________. Marcus Interpretator: Stijl en Boodschap in Mc 3,20-4,34. Brugge-Utrecht: Desclée de Brouwer, 1969.

Lane, William L. Commentary on the Gospel of Mark. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1974.

Lanham, Richard A. A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

La Potterie, I. de. "De Compositione Evangelii Marci," VD 44 (1966) 135-141.

Lausberg, Heinrich. Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. 2 vols. Munich: Max Hueber, 1960.

Lenglet, Ad. "La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7," Bib 53 (1972) 169-190.

Léon-Dufour, Xavier. "Trois chiasmes Johanniques," NTS 7 (1960-61) 249-255.

Lightfoot, Robert Henry. History and Interpretation in the Gospels. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

__________. The Gospel Message of St. Mark. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Lohfink, Norbert. Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11. AnBi 20. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Markus. 15th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

Lohr, Charles H. "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," CBQ 23 (1961) 403-435.

Lohse, Eduard. "Jesu Worte über den Sabbat," Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Edited by Walther Eltester. BNZW 26. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. Pp. 79-89.

Lund, Nils Wilhelm. Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in Formgeschichte. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.

Lundbom, Jack R. Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric. SBLDS 18 Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.

Maisch, Ingrid. Die Heilung des Gelähmten. SBS 52. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1971.

Mally, Edward J. "The Gospel According to Mark," The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Edited by Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Raymond E. Brown. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. Vol. 2, pp. 21-61.

Manson, T.W. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Edited by Matthew Black. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962.

Martinez, Ernest R. The Gospel Accounts of the Death of Jesus. Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1970.

Martyn, J. Louis. History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Marxsen, Willi. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by G. Buswell. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

__________. Mark the Evangelist. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville, et al. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Mead, Richard T. "The Healing of the Paralytic--A Unit?" JBL 80 (1961) 348-354.

Minear, Paul S. "Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology," Neues Testament und Geschicte, O. Cullmann zum 70. Geburstag. Edited by H. Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972. Pp. 79-89.

Minette de Tillesse, G. Le secret messianique dans l'Évangile de Marc. LD 47. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968.

Mourlon Beernaert, P. "Jésus controversé: Structure et théologie de Marc 2,1-3,6," NRT 95 (1973) 129-149.

__________. "Structure littéraire et lecture théologique de Marc 14, 17-52," L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et Rédaction. Edited by M. Sabbe. BETL 34. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1974. Pp. 241-267.

Muddiman, J.B. "Jesus and Fasting," Jésus aux origines de la christologie. Edited by J. Dupont. BETL 40. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1975. Pp. 271-281.

Münderlein, Gerhard. "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes," NTS 10 (1963-64) 88-104.

Muilenburg, James. "The Literary Character of Isaiah 34," JBL 49 (1940) 339-365.

__________. "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," Congress Volume. VTSup 1. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1953. Pp. 97-111.

__________. "Introduction and Exegesis to Isaiah, Chapters 40-66," Interpretor's Bible. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. Vol. 5, pp. 381-773.

__________. "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," VT 9 (1959) 347-365.

__________. "Form Criticism and Beyond," JBL 88 (1969) 1-18.

Murmelstein, B. "Jesu Gang durch die Saatfelder," Angelos 3 (1930) 111-120.

Myres, John L. Herodotus: Father of History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

__________. "The Pattern of the Odyssey," JHS 72 (1952) 1-19.

Neirynck, Frans. Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1972.

__________. "Jesus and the Sabbath: Some Observations on Mark II,27," Jésus aux origines de la christologie. Edited by J. Dupont. BETL 40. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1975. Pp. 227-270.

Nineham, Dennis Eric. The Gospel of St. Mark. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

Norden, Eduard. Die antike Kunstprosa. 2 vols. 5th ed. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1958.

Olrik, Axel. "Epic Laws of Folk Narrative," The Study of Folklore. Edited by Alan Dundes. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965. Pp. 129-141.

Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. "Streitgespräch und Parabel als Formen Markinischer Christologie," Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie. Edited by Georg Strecher. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1975. Pp. 375-394.

Pautrel, Reymond. "Les canons du mashal rabbinique," RSR 26 (1936) 5-45.

Perrin, Norman. Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

__________. What is Redaction Criticism? London: SPCK, 1970.

__________. "The Christology of Mark: A Study in Methodology," JR 51 (1971) 173-187.

__________. "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark." Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage. Edited by Hans Dieter Betz. Claremont, California: New Testament Colloquium, 1971. Pp. 1-78.

__________. A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

__________. The New Testament: An Introduction. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.

__________. "The High Priest's Question and Jesus' Answer," The Passion in Mark. Edited by Werner H. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976. Pp. 80-95.

__________. "The Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark," Int 30 (1976) 115-124.

Pesch, Rudolf. "Zur konzentrischen Struktur von Jona 1," Bib 47 (1966) 577-581.

__________. "Levi-Matthäus (Mc 2:14/Mt 9:9,10:3). Ein Beitrag zur Losung eines alten Problems," ZNW 59 (1968) 40-56.

__________. "Eine neue Lehre aus Macht: Eine Studie zu Mk 1, 21-28," Evangelienforschung: Ausgewählte Aufsätze deutscher Exegeten. Edited by J.B. Bauer. Graz-Cologne: Styria, 1968. Pp. 241-276.

__________. Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1968.

__________. "Das Zöllnergastmahl (Mk 2,15-17)," Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.P. Béda Rigaux. Edited by Albert Descamps and André de Halleux. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1970. Pp. 63-87.

Pritchard, John Paul. A Literary Approach to the New Testament. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972.

Radday, Yehuda T. "Chiasm in Samuel," Linguistica Biblica 9/10 (1971) 21-31.

__________. "Chiasm in Tora," Linguistica Biblica 19 (1972) 12-23.

__________. "Chiasm in Joshua, Judges and Others," Linguistica Biblica 27/28 (1973) 6-13.

__________. "Chiasm in Kings," Linguistica Biblica 31 (1974) 52-67.

Radermakers, Jean. "L'évangile de Marc: Structure et théologie," L'évangile selon Marc. Tradition et rédaction. Edited by M. Sabbe. BETL 34. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1974. Pp. 221-239.

__________. La bonne nouvelle de Jésus selon saint Marc. 2 vols. Brussels: Institut d'Études Théologiques, 1974.

Ridout, George P. "Prose Compositional Techniques in the Succession Narrative (2 Sam. 7, 9-20; 1 Kings 1-2)." Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union (Berkeley), 1971.

__________. "The Rape of Tamar," Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg. Edited by Jared J. Jackson and Martin Kessler. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 1. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1974. Pp. 75-84.

Riesenfeld, Harald. Jesus transfiguré. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1947.

Robbins, Vernon K. "The Healing of Blind Bartimaeus (10:46-52) in the Marcan Theology," JBL 92 (1973) 224-243.

Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: SCM Press, 1962.

Rohde, Joachim. Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.

Rolland, Philippe. "From the Genesis to the End of the World: The Plan of Matthew's Gospel," BTB 2 (1972) 155-176.

Ropes, James Hardy. The Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Schmid, Josef. The Gospel According to Mark. Translated by Kevin Condon. RNT. Staten Island: Alba House, 1968.

Schmidt, K.L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesus. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919.

Scholes, Robert and Kellogg, Robert. The Nature of Narrative. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Schulz, Siefried. "Markus und das Alte Testament," ZTK 58 (1961) 184-197.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Anmerkungen zur Theologie des Markus," Neotestamentica et patristica. Eine Fruendesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinen 60. Geburtstag überreicht. NovTSup 6. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962. Pp. 35-46.

__________. The Good News According to Mark. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1970.

Sheppard, J. T. The Pattern of the Iliad. London: Methuen, 1922.

Simon, Ulrich. "The Problem of Biblical Narrative," Theology 72 (1969) 243-253.

Smith, Charles W.F. "No Time for Figs," JBL 79 (1960) 315-327.

Stein, Robert H. "What is Redaktionsgeschichte?" JBL 88 (1969) 45-56.

__________. "The Proper Methdology for Ascertaining a Markan Redaction History," NovT 13 (1971) 181-198.

Strack, Herman L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrash. Vol. 1. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961.

Suhl, Alfred. Die Funktion der Altetestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium. Guttersloh: Gerd Mohr, 1965.

Sundwall, Johannes. Die Zusammensetzung des Markusevngeliums. Abo: Abo Akademi, 1934.

Swete, Henry Barclay. The Gospel According to St Mark. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1913.

Tagawa, Kenzo. Miracles et Évangile. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.

Talbert, Charles H. "Artistry and Theology: An Analysis of the Architecture of Jn 1,19-5,47," CBQ 32 (1970) 341-366.

__________. Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts. SBLMS 20. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.

Taylor, Vincent. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. 2d ed. London: Macmillan, 1964.

__________. The Gospel According to St. Mark. 2d ed. London: Macmillan, 1966.

Thiering, Barbara. "The Poetic Forms of the Hodayot," JSS 8 (1963) 189-209.

Tödt, Heinz Eduard. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

Trible, Phyllis. "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," JAAR 41 (1973) 30-48.

__________. "Wisdom Builds a Poem: The Architecture of Proverbs 1:20-33," JBL 94 (1975) 509-518.

__________. "Two Women in a Man's World: A Reading of the Book of Ruth," Soundings 59 (1976) 251-279.

Trocmé, Etienne. Jesus as Seen by his Contemporaries. Translated by R.A. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973.

__________. The Formation of the Gospel According to Mark. Translated by Pamela Gaughan. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.

Turner, C.H. "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel," JTS 25 (1924) 377-386; 26 (1925) 12-20, 145-156, 225-240, 336-345; 27 (1926) 58-62; 28 (1927) 9-30, 349-362; 29 (1928) 276-289, 346-361.

Turner, Nigel. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.

__________. Vol. 4: Style. James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976.

UMI

Vanhoye, Albert. La structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963.

__________. A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Translated by James Swetnam. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.

__________. Structure and theology of the accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels. Translated by C.H. Giblin. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1967.

__________. "La composition de Jn 5,19-30." Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.P. Béda Rigaux. Edited by Albert Descamps and André de Halleux. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1970. Pp. 259-274.

Van Iersel, B.M.F. "La vocation de Lévi," De Jésus aux Évangiles. Edited by I. de La Potterie. BETL 25:2. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1967. Pp. 212-232.

Vermes, Geza. Jesus the Jew. London: Collins, 1973.

Via, Dan O., Jr. Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament: A Structuralist Approach to Hermeneutic. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Weber, Joseph C., Jr. "Jesus' Opponents in the Gospel of Mark," JBR 34 (1966) 214-222.

Weeden, Theodore J. Mark--Traditions in Conflict. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

__________. "The Conflict between Mark and his Opponents over Kingdom Theology. 1973 Seminar Papers. Edited by George MacRae. SBLASP 109. Society of Biblical Literature, 1973. Vol. 2, pp. 203-241.

Weiss, Johannes. Das älteste Evangelium. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903.

Wellek, René and Warren, Austin. Theory of Literature. 3d ed. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1962.

Wellhausen, Julius. Das Evangelium Marci. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1903.

Whitman, Cedric H. Homer and the Heroic Tradition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Wilder, Amos N. The New Voice: Religion, Literature, Hermeneutics. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

__________. Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Wrede, William. "Zur Heilung des Gelähmten (Mc 2,1ff.)," ZNW 5 (1904) 354-358.

Wright, Addison G. "The Riddle of the Sphinx: The Structure of the Book of Qoheleth," CBQ 30 (1968) 313-334.

Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate over Romans." CBQ 38 (1976) 330-351.

Zerwick, Max. Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1937.